



## **SRS Citizen's Advisory Board**

### **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

## **Waste Management Committee**

**Aiken Federal Building, Aiken, SC  
August 19, 2003**

The SRS Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Waste Management Committee (WMC) met on Tuesday, August 19, 2003, 5:00, at the Federal Building, Aiken, SC. The purposes of the meeting were to discuss the Glass Waste Storage Building #2, Solid Waste Preparation for Accelerated Cleanup Increased Waste Volumes, and to receive public comment.

Attendance was as follows:

#### **CAB Members**

-Bill Willoughby  
-Bill Lawless  
Gerald Devitt  
Wade Waters  
-Harold Rahn  
William Lawrence  
Jean Sulc  
-Murray Riley

#### **Stakeholders**

Bill McDonell  
Todd Crawford  
Russ Messick  
Karen Patterson  
Steven Gurly^  
Mal McKibbin  
Lee Poe  
Phillip Lord^  
Ernie Chaput  
Chuck Terhune  
Mike Schoener+  
Rick McLeod\*

#### **DOE/Contractors**

Jeff Allison, DOE  
Alice Doswell, DOE  
Larry Ling, DOE  
Dennis Godbee, DOE  
Ron Campbell, WSRC  
Rick Ford, DOE  
Sonny Goldston, BNFL-SW  
Howard Pope, DOE  
John Knox, DOE  
Guy Girard, DOE  
Nancy Lowry, WSRC  
Joe Carter, WSRC  
Gail Spader, DOE  
de'Lisa Bratcher, DOE  
Mary Flora, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Kelly Way, WSRC

\*CAB Technical Advisor  
-WM committee members  
+Facilitator  
^Press

Bill Willoughby called the meeting to order at 5:00. He welcomed those in attendance and asked for introductions. Mr. Willoughby asked Mr. Schoener to announce the agenda change to allow Mr. Allison to speak. Mr. Schoener asked for cooperation and outlined the meeting rules.

Wade Waters, CAB chair, asked to make a quick comment. He told the committee that he had invited Jeff Allison, DOE-SR Manager, to address the committee about the recent letter from Jessie Roberson, Environmental Management (EM) Deputy Secretary. Mr. Waters explained that on July 7, 2003, the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM) sent a memorandum that was disturbing to the CAB. Mr. Waters believes if these guidelines are

followed, the CAB's effectiveness would be cut by 50%. Mr. Waters then asked Mr. Allison to take the floor.

Mr. Allison told the group that he has read all the correspondence and has had a number of discussions with staff in an attempt to "read between the lines" of the directive. He believes the bottom line to be that Ms. Roberson was directed to demonstrate more accountability concerning CAB costs complex-wide.

Mr. Allison outlined the costs of the CAB and the personnel that the budget covers. The scope and accountability directive is for the \$349,000 dollars that the CAB receives from DOE. He stated that the technical support that WSRC provides isn't involved in the guidance. He reiterated that the SR CAB has been very effective, and it would not make sense to change all that.

He added that the funding vehicle may change so that DOE has control over the dollars, and can directly report that to HQ. He claimed that DOE needs direct vehicles to fund the people that support the CAB. He told the group that he was meeting with Ms. Roberson next week and anticipates a number of discussions on the new directives. The DOE –SR plans to develop guidance on how they plan to implement Ms. Roberson's directives. Mr. Allison then opened the floor for comments.

Karen Patterson, former CAB chair, asked to comment. She stated that the SSAB independence has been maintained; therefore, increased accountability and visibility don't make sense. Also, if the site changes the contractor, then the public and the CAB won't have the same information and support that they have now. Thirdly, she stated that she was personally insulted. She added that she was a former CAB chairperson and that the integrity of SSAB's and their credibility of work has never been questioned.

Mr. Allison then stated that Ms. Roberson wanted to make sure that the CAB's ability would remain on the level it is now. She didn't want to degrade the ability to get the job done.

This led Ms. Patterson to her fourth point. She stated that her question to Jessie would be, "Why does Ms. Roberson want to change the CAB, since it is successful by DOE's own definition?" Ms. Patterson ended by saying that Jessie Roberson is going to degrade the ability of the CAB to function.

Mr. Waters asked to make comment next. He told the group that as soon as he had seen Ms. Roberson's July 7 guidance, he sent her a letter. Mr. Waters considers Ms. Roberson's response letter to be totally unresponsive. She addressed none of the concerns that Mr. Waters had raised in his letter. He believes that Ms. Roberson had nothing to do with writing the letter, and that Sandra Waisley wrote the response to each of the advisory boards.

He went on to say that he believes that Ms. Roberson has not received the letters and the questions that the SR CAB and public have raised. Mr. Water's stated that the SR CAB is the only board supported by the site contractor. He added that Ms. Roberson has emphasized a number of times the superior work of the SRS CAB and has stated, on more than one occasion,

that this CAB was the best in the complex. Yet, Mr. Waters added that it appears that SR CAB is the one getting hurt.

He continued by saying that much of his concern lies with the excellent WSRC support staff and their jobs. He told the committee that the present board administrator had worked with Jessie Roberson eleven years ago to build a CAB. It is because of this and the support from WSRC that the CAB has the incredible historical perspective that it now has. The other sites used their own contractors funded by DOE, but SRS does not do this.

Lee Poe asked to take the floor next. He began by saying that he had understood Mr. Allison's saying that the only impact of the SR interpretation of this DOE directive would be to provide better accountability of the CAB funds. He believes accountability of public funds is a responsibility and a must. His concern is that one interpretation of the DOE directive could change the way the CAB operates and could result in a significant loss of support continuity. He added that he has never been a CAB member, but the CAB meetings do an excellent job of keeping the public informed and involved. That function should not be allowed to suffer.

He expressed how this CAB is an effective, organized way of keeping the public involved, but he is concerned that Ms. Roberson's changes will significantly lower the public's effectiveness. He asked that DOE not lower the efficiency of all our dealings with the site. He does agree that DOE must manage their funds, but asked that they not lower the effectiveness of the CAB and public or the continuity from the site's personnel.

Mr. Willoughby, WM Committee chair, asked to be recognized for comment. One of his concerns is that the apparent independence of the CAB must be maintained. He recalled how he wanted to become a CAB member because of his experience working on projects (CVTR) that interfaced with Savannah River Site in the 1950's when there was no independent group. He believes that things would have been much different and that some of the issues that the CAB and WSRC are struggling with today would not have come about, if there had been an independent group of citizens overlooking the organization. He emphasized that the local communities believe and trust the CAB because of their independence from DOE. He fears that the structure Ms. Roberson appears to outline will erode the trust the community has developed in the process and the organization.

Bill Lawless spoke next. His concern is that this change by Ms. Roberson's office is a major change in the way the boards are operated, and the way it was handled is disturbing. He explained how the CAB has worked many years to develop a good relationship and rapport with DOE-SR and HQ, yet he feels this change was announced in the dark. He talked about how Ms. Roberson's intention was discovered after the letters from her office at DOE-HQ had been sent out. He maintains that he would give SRS and other personnel a high grade for discussing resolution of this episode with the public. However, Jessie Roberson and Spencer Abraham would receive failing grades on discussing and implementing this change with the public.

He continued by saying that after ten years, one would hope that DOE would know how to work with the public. It seems as if Abraham and Roberson have taken a step backwards. The process they followed was the worst way in the world to arrive at a decision affecting the public. Mr.

Lawless added that he trusts Jeff Allison and knows he will make an effort, but these surprises from the Secretary and Assistant Secretary have caught everyone off guard. If this situation does work out and does succeed, he would give the credit to DOE-SR, not DOE-HQ.

Jean Sulc asked for the next steps for resolution. She also asked if those that are affected have any say in the alternatives, and lastly how could the accounting on the \$349,000 budget be improved.

Mr. Allison responded that DOE-SR is within a few days of sending a response to DOE-HQ. He added that he has committed to talk to Mr. Waters before the response is sent to HQ. He assured the committee that DOE is NOT saying that the CAB has mismanaged funds in any way, but that DOE-SR must be able to report the expenditure of funds to HQ.

Mr. Crawford asked to build on what Mr. Willoughby had said. He explained how this episode has destroyed credibility and trust. He hated to see this happen. Eventhough the CAB's are an EM function, the public doesn't understand the organizational structure. He is afraid that this whole situation will undermine the trust the public has for the DOE.

Mr. Allison acknowledged that this situation has hurt many people, but emphasized that was not the intent. He added that many fences must now be mended.

Mr. Schoener asked for further comment. There being none, he introduced the next speaker.

### **Glass Waste Storage Building #2, Guy Girard, DOE Federal Project Director**

Mr. Girard outlined the project scope. The scope basically involves constructing a new building, upgrading the design to existing codes and standards, deleting non-essential space, and interfacing with Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) operations.

He highlighted details from previous CAB meetings and moved into explaining the status of the project today. Parsons, the subcontractor, is 50% complete with respect to design activity. DOE is utilizing the Army Corps of Engineers as the contracting officer. WSRC retains some functional and technical input, and DOE-SR retains overall technical responsibility. He explained the schedule and the funding. He added that the design and construction for site preparation work is being performed by WSRC.

He ended his presentation by stating that the design effort is underway. The lion's share of time will be devoted to complete the construction. Construction award of the main facility is scheduled to begin 12/03. He added that the schedule presently meets the schedule commitments.

Mr. Lawless asked for the number of canisters the buildings would hold and the design changes that have been made since the CAB's recommendation #13, written in 1995.

Mr. Girard responded that GWSB #1 has a capacity of 2286, with 2164 usable positions. GWSB #2 will have a capacity of 2340 positions, for an overall capacity of 4604 storage positions. Concerning the design changes, Mr. Girard stated that eventhough the structure can be cooled passively, the design calls for forced cooling.

Mr. Willoughby asked when the committee could expect a presentation on the design information (as requested in Recommendation #13). Mr. Girard stated that Parsons is in the process of upgrading the design, but he would be glad to come back and give a presentation on the design.

He offered some of the major differences in Building #1 and #2 are seismic differences and geotechnical work. He also stated that the site better understands what would happen in the case of a seismic event.

Much discussion followed concerning the loss of vaults, the small business bid, the full time employees required, the need date, and incentives.

GWSB #1 is forecast to be filled in 2006. Higher loading in the canisters will give SR more time, but DOE wants GWSB #2 to be available.

Mr. Poe asked if the contract contained a late consequence clause for the facility. Mr. Girard answered that incentives may be offered for completing the construction before the schedule. Mr. Poe emphasized that the last things the committee would want to see are the shut down of DWPF or waste left in tanks. He added that if SR adjusted can production downward, it would be the same as shutting down DWPF.

Mr. Lawless discussed several of his considerations. He has a concern of building operation if the facility is shut down and institutional control is lost. He stated that the reason this motion #13 was written dealt with long term considerations. The committee was concerned in 1995 that Yucca Mountain's opening would be controversial, and it has been. He also added that there was concern that the canisters may never leave SR. He and Mr. Willoughby requested an update on the design criteria that DOE has given Parsons.

Mr. Poe discussed his understanding of the situation. He believed that if this building lost forced ventilation, it could be cooled passively. He discussed the Yucca Mountain EIS "no action" alternative in which the roof falls in and the vault is filled with water. He further discussed the scenario if DOE walked away from the building. Discussion followed of a third GWSB, the lead time needed to begin building a new building, forced ventilation versus passive coiling, schedule, and building design.

Mr. Schoener paused to focus the committee's concerns. He stated that the two that seem to continue to surface are the need to keep DWPF operating and the design considerations of the new GWSB #2 that need to be presented to the committee.

Bill McDonell expressed his concern about the GWSB #1 and #2 becoming long term repositories for the canisters if Yucca Mountain never opens. He understands the situation, but does not want to assume that DOE must design a facility to meet specifications in case GWSB becomes a permanent repository.

Mr. Girard explained the reasons for using the Army Corps of Engineers and a small business contract. He has a high degree of confidence that GWSB #2 can be built in less than 25 months.

according to the schedule. Mr. Girard agreed to come back and present the design to the committee.

### **SW Support for Increased Waste Volumes from Accelerated Clean up-Sonny Goldston, WSRC/BNFL**

Mr. Goldston explained the picture of the M-area demolition in the background of the first page. He continued to explain the cubic meters of increased waste through FY 06 and described the major projects that are causing the waste increase.

He explained that more than 40 facilities will be taken down. The waste will consist of sanitary waste, depleted uranium, highly enriched uranium 235 (HEU), and Low level waste (LLW).

Mr. Goldston outlined the working solutions that SW has established on site. He explained the Low Level radioactive Waste Volume (1995-2006) chart, and moved into an explanation of the schedule efficiencies.

He explained the Bulk and Off Site Shipping Subcommittee (“BOSS”), which is a committee that has been established to prioritize disposal needs, to level the work loading, and to manage facility capacities. There is a contact assigned to each project.

Mr. Goldston explained how the BOSS levels the workload based on project manpower, work scope, and SW&I capacities.

He explained how SW has evaluated the disposal trenches to increase the capacity and efficiency. Mr. Goldston explained how, a few years ago, the site was disposing of LLW in vaults. Now, the site uses slit and engineered trenches to dispose of waste. This change is a direct result of CAB input and recommendations.

Mr. Goldston explained the waste packaging efficiencies. The site is looking at fewer and larger packages in order to reduce paper work and numerous other costs. Traditionally the site has used 45 and 90 ft3 B-12 containers, but is now looking at alternate bulk containers. One such container is the “Sea land”. These units are acquired from a small business in Charleston, SC. This company takes excess sea lands, refurbishes them, and sells them to SR. The site then fills the sealands with waste and disposes of them in trenches. Some of these containers are lidded and some are tarped. These tarped sea-lands replace the previously used soft-sided bags and resolve the contamination concerns the site had with the soft-sided bags. Sixty sealands have been disposed of already.

SW is also using the “re-usable roll-offs” for low activity waste. Mr. Goldston explained the method of use, but stated this method requires increased contamination control and monitoring. . This container is similar to a dumpster attached to a hydraulic. The waste is unloaded on a tarp and bulldozed into a trench.

Mr. Goldston described some of the new technologies being tried that also reduce labor costs. The In-field RadCon survey eliminates transporting samples to the central lab. The Insitu object counting Systems (ISOCS) are portable gamma monitors deployed to characterize and segregate waste.

He continued to explain how SW plans to utilize the “bounding case” waste stream characterization to reduce waste segregation and handling requirements for low activity waste. This process requires only one measure of an entire unit to show that the requirements are met. These smears can also be done right in the field. As long as SW knows the bounding number, then SW knows the radioactivity is within the WAC.

Finally, Mr. Goldston explained that, where it is cost effective or required, the site would ship items off site to Nevada Test site, Envirocare, or Emille, Alabama. SR can’t dispose of mixed waste on site.

Lastly, Mr. Goldston showed pictures of and explained the proposed non-rad C&D landfill at the site’s center. Benefits include no tipping or transport fees, unlike the Three Rivers Run landfill. Registration with SCDHEC is planned for fall 2003. Mr. Poe asked for a presentation on construction and regulation of the debris landfill.

Mr. Goldston summarized; then asked for questions and discussion. Mr. Poe asked, if the site states that there is a 4-6 times waste increase, then what was the basis or base line of waste in order to derive these numbers. Mr. Goldston stated that the facilitators for each project calculate the amount of waste the project will generate.

Mr. Poe then asked questions concerning building demolition, the Deactivation & Decommissioning (D&D) plan, and historical preservation. He asked that someone speak to the CAB on what is being preserved on site. Ms. Haas stated that Perry Holcomb is setting up a Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee meeting to discuss the D&D Plan.

Mr. Poe questioned the “bounding case” waste stream characterization. He believes this to be an impossible task. Mr. Goldston responded that the site would have to know what is going to be in that waste stream. Instead of measuring every piece of concrete, the gross measure of the entire contents of a container will be measured. Therefore, the site can “bound” that waste stream by saying all of that particular waste is within a certain limit. Ms. Doswell added that before a building was knocked down, samples would be taken from each part of a building to make sure it meets the criteria. Therefore, the site does not have to sample each bag of debris that is brought out. Workers would assume that each is the same and meets the standard.

Mr. Willoughby added that according to the transportation rules, waste could be shipped if it is below the bounding limit. One doesn’t have to know what is in each drum specifically, as long as the drum is below the radioactivity level. Measurements can be made, but they are done on the whole package rather than on each individual item.

Mr. Poe doesn’t believe the bounding case analysis is a good idea and asked that someone come back and present once the site had assumed some experience with bounding.

Mr. Willoughby announced that there are two upcoming meetings because of the number of topics.

September 8, we will hear about Tank Space Management and Waste Removal.

On September 16, the committee will hear about Cobalt 60 and that record of decision (ROD)

and an update on the WIR lawsuit. Mr. Willoughby cautioned the committee not to be optimistic at this point on their power to solve the WIR problem.

Mr. Willoughby asked for public comment. Mr. Poe asked to speak and made two points. His first was that the only reference in the Strategic Plan to tank closure is that the site will have closed the HLW tanks by 2020. He emphasized that closure won't be accomplished until some decision is made to start doing that. His second point was that if the CAB wants to save money, then the way the meeting was run tonight was not necessary. Mr. Lawless spoke next. He indicated that he thought the meeting was run smoothly and was handled well.

### **Action Items from 8-19-03 WM Committee Meeting**

#### **Action**

- Design specs for GWSB #2
- A briefing on material availability for the GWSB #2 in order to make an informed decision on the construction schedule
- Presentation on what is being done on historical preservation of site buildings
- Overall D&D Disposition plan (Teresa Haas is working with Perry Holcomb to set-up a committee meeting.)
- Copy of Performance Assessment (Lee Poe)
- Questions of criticality concern with the Uranium etc. in the buildings being torn down (F-area)
- Presentation on PA
- Presentation on how the "Bounding Case Analysis" Scenario is working after the site has had some experience with it
- (Maybe joint ER meeting)
- Presentation on these construction debris (C&D) landfills to include regulations
- Waste characterization for landfill
- Presentation on the WIR.
- Letter from Abraham to Congress: Lee Poe (complete)
- Send Murray Riley and William Lawrence a copy of Strategic Plan

Mr. Willoughby adjourned the meeting at 7:40.