



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

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

**March 22-23, 2004**

**Sheraton Hotel & Conference Center Columbia, S.C.**

#### **Monday, March 22, 2004, Attendance**

##### **SRS CAB Members**

Meryl Alalof  
Donna Antonucci  
Leon Chavous  
Gerald Devitt  
Mary Drye  
Mel Galin  
Perry Holcomb  
William Lawrence  
Wendell Lyon  
Danielle Mackie

Bob Meisenheimer  
Darryl Nettles  
Karen Patterson  
Harold Rahn  
Murray Riley  
Jean Sulc  
Bill Vogelee  
Bill Willoughby  
Gloria Williams-Way

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

Charlie Anderson, DOE  
Alice Doswell, DOE  
Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC

DOE/Contractors  
Becky Craft, DOE  
Gerri Flemming, DOE  
Virginia Kay, DOE  
Gail Whitney, DOE  
Doug Hintze, DOE  
Jim Buice, DOE  
Fran Williams, WSRC  
John Dickenson, WSRC  
Kelly Way, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Sonny Goldston, WSRC  
Jim Heffner, WSRC  
Joe Carter, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC  
Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC

##### **Stakeholders**

Glynn Carroll, GANE  
Mary Kelly, SC League of WV

##### **Regulators**

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC

Rick McLeod, Board Advisor  
Mike Schoener, Facilitator

#### **Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee Report**

Jim Heffner, Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC), provided a history of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Environmental Monitoring Program, including effluent monitoring, environmental surveillance and program results (see attached). Mr. Heffner noted that SRS has a long history of environmental monitoring activities, including a comprehensive environmental monitoring program, gaining knowledge of release types and quantities resulting in a clear understanding of dose impacts to the public. Mr. Heffner stated the purpose of environmental monitoring is to characterize and quantify contaminants; demonstrate compliance with applicable standards; calculate radiation exposures to the public; and assess any effects on the local environment.

Mr. Heffner pointed out that baseline studies were conducted in 1951-1952 by E.I. DuPont and the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Also, in 1951 work was conducted by the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, and in 1953 the SRS formally started its own Environmental Monitoring Program. The Environmental Monitoring Program complies with the following:

State and Federal Regulations (Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Hazardous Waste Regulations (RCRA), Landfill Regulations); DOE Orders; and Best Management Practices.

Mr. Heffner explained the importance of knowing the difference between Environmental Monitoring and Environmental Surveillance. Environmental Monitoring is defined as the collection of samples or data from the point at which a facility discharges liquid or gaseous releases to the environment. Environmental Surveillance is defined as the collection of samples of air, water, soil, foodstuff, biota, and other media – or of data – from the ambient environment. The Monitoring Program is designed to review radionuclide knowledge via process knowledge, movement through the environment, any health impacts and sampling of locations through exposure pathways.

At this point in the presentation, Mr. Heffner turned the meeting over to Pete Fledderman, WSRC. Mr. Fledderman indicated that there were several types of samples taken at the SRS, including the following:

- Ambient air
- Rainwater
- Surface water
- Drinking water
- Food products
- Deer and Hogs
- Fish
- Soil
- Sediment
- Vegetation
- Groundwater

In the radiological category the site conducts an Enhanced Tritium Monitoring (ETM) Program, which is designed to provide timely notification to downriver consumers of significant changes in the river's tritium levels. This effort is accomplished in a three step process: measure tritium concentrations at onsite stream locations; calculate river concentrations; and notify downstream if the Savannah River is projected to exceed a 5,000 picocuries/liter concentration (one-fourth the Drinking Water Standard).

Mr. Fledderman discussed the Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) Program in place at SRS, which ensures that field sampling, laboratory analysis, and data management and review yield results that are precise, accurate and reasonable. Field QA/QC ensures representative samples and accurate data through field calibration, consistency of measurement (time and spatial), and audits. Laboratory QA/QC ensures accurate results through standards and

calibration, blanks, duplicates and spikes, inter-lab comparison, external QA programs, certification, and audits. Data QA/QC ensures reasonableness of data, identifies samples for investigation through data trending, data consistency (radionuclide ratios) and transport pathways, release/flux calculations, and comparison with external agencies.

Mr. Fledderman stated that all results of the Program are reported annually in the SRS Site Environmental Report, and noted the 2002 report is out and available to the public. In addition, the 2003 report is being prepared at this time. Mr. Fledderman discussed program verification and provided results for 2002.

The SRS monitoring results for 2002 airborne and liquid releases, as well as all potential radiation doses from the site were well below applicable regulatory standards. Additionally, the total radiation dose to the public living near SRS is well below DOE's 100-millirem/year standard.

### **Waste Management Committee Report**

Harold Rahn, Waste Management (WM) Committee High Level Waste vice chair, outlined the first recommendation entitled HLW Proposal, sixth draft (see attached). Much discussion ensued about this recommendation. Ms. Karen Patterson asked about the Federal Facilities Agreement to close two tanks in 2004. Joe Carter, WSRC clarified that the Department had made an official request to delay and reschedule the closing of those tanks to March and June 2007. Keith Collinsworth verified that SCDHEC had received a request to reschedule the Tank 18 & 19 milestones. He also stated that the request is under consideration. Presently, DHEC is unsure of a response, and discussions are ongoing. SCDHEC is also considering the salt waste strategy and Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) lawsuit.

Bill Willoughby questioned the interaction between "clean out" and "closure." Doug Hintze, DOE, stated that the site is continuing with cleanup, but closure is impacted by the WIR, since it includes grouting of tanks. SRS can't "close" tanks, but can "clean out" tanks. Mr. Collinsworth added that if funding were available, the site could remove waste and treat salt. He added that waste removal and salt removal isn't impacted. However, putting material in the Saltstone vaults and/or putting grout in tanks is stopped by the WIR.

Mr. Mel Galin suggested adding a fifth recommendation that would separate clean up and closure. After much discussion, it was agreed that the site could remove waste with out impact to the lawsuit, but SRS could not close tanks without impact to the WIR lawsuit. Mr. Carter stated that the WIR impacts the ability to process salt waste. Mr. Collinsworth stated that DOE had indicated that there is a salt strategy in place where it would be possible to process HLW in tanks through SWPF and recycle the Salt Waste Processing Facility output back into the tanks.

The group continued with a discussion of the 2005 budget. The CAB wants assurance that DOE-Headquarters is fair in their allocation of funding among sites. The group discussed the fact that Hanford's HLW program funding was increased, and that they are not impacted by the WIR lawsuit. Mr. Collinsworth told the group that HQ plans to fund Hanford because their program will vitrify their HLW into canisters, which then will be sent to Yucca Mountain. Since SR's program would leave some waste on site, HQ feels vulnerable.

Bill Vogele asked for a recap of the WIR lawsuit, which Mr. Collinsworth provided. SRS CAB Technical Advisor Rick McLeod offered taking the words "closure" from part 4, (leaving the words removal and treatment) and adding a fifth recommendation that would state that "DOE-HQ initiate planning and budget for pursuing HLW tank closure at SRS." The committee agreed to this change.

Mr. Darryl Nettles, WM Committee vice-chair for SW, introduced the second recommendation entitled "SRS TRU Waste Program Acceleration" (see attached). Mr. McLeod stated that there was some information he needed to obtain, and he would add this into the recommendation off-line. After very little discussion and a few clarification questions, the committee agreed to accept this motion.

### **Nuclear Materials Committee Report**

Jerry Devitt, Nuclear Materials Committee (NMC) Chair, opened the meeting by announcing that Karen Patterson had accepted the position of vice chair of the NMC. He then asked Ms. Patterson to lead the discussion on the Plutonium (Pu) Disposition draft recommendation.

Ms. Patterson introduced the draft recommendation as one that was driven by the DOE responses to Recommendations 170 and 171. Upon review, the NMC had determined that the DOE responses did not adequately address the CAB's concerns. She stated the two recommendations have been closed as incomplete. According to Ms. Patterson, the NMC proposes this draft recommendation as a means to restate their concerns relative to DOE's plans for the full disposition of Pu at SRS.

Ms. Patterson explained the background of the disposition plans by detailing the history of *the Surplus Pu Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS). She said the original Record of Decision (ROD) announced the Department's plans to build the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) at SRS, but this was later canceled. In an amended ROD, DOE announced that the Immobilization Facility, by which DOE was to disposition up to 17 metric tons of Pu under the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Program, was also canceled. Another amended ROD was issued in 2003, and the recent postponement of the MOX program has caused the NMC to be concerned about the Department's strategy for full Pu disposition.

Ms. Patterson further stated that there were four alternatives under the Performance Management Plan for the Pu. Two of the alternatives involved aqueous processing, another involved the use of 3013 containers, and one called for the vitrification of the Pu. Since the EIS had discounted some of these disposition options as less than optimum, she was concerned that DOE was making key decisions without adequate analysis or public participation.

Ms. Patterson opened the floor for questions and discussion. Several questions were raised about the viability of the MOX program and consolidation of Pu at SRS. In response, Ms. Patterson told the members that she believed the MOX program would continue but at a slower pace. She reminded the Board that DOE had already briefed them on consolidation efforts, and had indicated that SRS was under consideration for the complex-wide consolidation of Pu. Ms. Patterson summarized the situation as one where DOE has made more effort to gain public input on how to dispose of worker booties than on a sound disposition strategy for Pu.

### **Strategic & Legacy Management (SLM) Committee**

William Lawrence, Chair, announced that Bill Vogele had agreed to remain as the Vice-Chair of the SLM Committee. He stated that the next meetings for the SLM Committee would be a meeting on the Performance Management Plan (PMP) on Monday, April 12, 5:00 p.m., at the North Augusta Community Center and a Risk Based End State (RBES) Vision Document Workshop on Tuesday, April 13, 8:30 a.m. at the same location.

Mr. Lawrence reviewed the status of the SLM Committee recommendations. With no comments to the contrary, recommendation #165 was moved from Pending to Open; recommendation #166 was moved from Open to Closed; and recommendation #178 was moved from Pending to Closed.

### **SRS Budget Update**

Jim Buice, DOE Director of the Budget Division, reviewed the budget for fiscal year (FY) 2004 and 2005 (see attached). He mentioned the dollars are appropriated by Congress and then allocated to SRS. While we are executing the 2004 budget, the 2005 budget was submitted to Congress in February and the site is currently working on developing the 2006 budget.

Mr. Buice reviewed the total budget breakout by site program. The variances for the programs from FY04 to FY05 are: Environmental Management (EM) -\$70 million, Defense Programs + \$13 million, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation + \$33 million, Safeguards and Security – National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) no change, and Other Programs - \$15 million. The total variance for the Site from FY04 to FY05 is - \$39 million. Mr. Buice explained some of the projects included in the programs.

The EM budget summary variance for FY04 and FY05 was broken down and is as follows: Site Acceleration Completion - \$59 million, Safeguards and Security - \$2 million, Environmental Services - \$8 million, and Federal Program Direction no change. The total for EM, as stated previously, was - \$70 million.

Mr. Buice reviewed the EM life-cycle and end state dates for the completion of some of the major activities at the site by program. The completion of cleanup for EM is 2025. Mr. Buice then reviewed the planned accomplishments for 2004 and 2005.

During the question and answer session, it was pointed out that for 2005, HLW funding for activities associated with WIR was not included. This amounts to around \$350 million complex-wide and around \$188 million for SRS. It was asked that further information be given on the delta of an approximately \$60 shortfall for the EM Site Acceleration Completion. Also, the impact on the workforce for the \$60 million shortfall and the \$188 million HLW shortfall was requested. This concern was highlighted due to the information in the Nuclear Materials Recommendation discussed previously that indicated that one full time equivalent employee equaled \$100,000. There was much concern expressed about the potential for large numbers of site employees that would be laid off. Mr. Buice mentioned that the site is working on resolving the funding issue and is in hopes of getting the funding restored. There was discussion on creative funding such as vendors swapping services for assets, Spent Nuclear Fuel receipts and

deactivation and decommissioning (D&D). Perry Holcomb noted the presentation was excellent and very informative and requested that a budget presentation be given in the Aiken area as well.

### **Public Comments**

Glynn Carroll, Georgians Against Nuclear Energy (GANE), commented that a resolution had been introduced by the Georgia State House of Representatives to reinstate the GA grant from DOE for environmental monitoring.

### **Tuesday, March 23, 2004, Attendance**

#### **SRS CAB Members**

Donna Antonucci	Darryl Nettles
Leon Chavous	Karen Patterson
Gerald Devitt	Harold Rahn
Mary Drye	Murray Riley
Mel Galin	Jean Sulc
Cassandra Henry	Bill Voge
Perry Holcomb	Carolyn Williams
William Lawrence	Gloria Williams-Way
Wendell Lyon	Bill Willoughby
Danielle Mackie	
Bob Meisenheimer	

#### **Stakeholders**

Glynn Carroll, GANE	Rick McLeod, Board Advisor
Thomas Rolka, SCDHEC	Mike Schoener, Facilitator
Mary Kelly, SC League of WV	
Kathryn Hauer	
Don Kantor	
Amanda Martin, CPRC	
Kristen Long, SCDHEC	
Mike French	
Pat Casey	

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

Charlie Anderson, DOE  
Alice Doswell, DOE  
Robert Pope, EPA  
Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC

#### **DOE/Contractors**

Becky Craft, DOE  
Gerri Flemming, DOE  
Virginia Kay, DOE  
Bill Clark, DOE  
Sachiko McAlhany, DOE  
Fran Williams, WSRC  
John Dickenson, WSRC  
Kelly Way, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC  
Sonny Goldston, WSRC  
Jack Devine, WSRC  
Joe Carter, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC  
Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Paul Saurborn, WSRC  
Kerry Dunn, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Tiajuana Cochauer, USDA  
Forest Service

### **Approval of the Minutes**

The meeting minutes of the January 2004 meeting were approved with no changes.

### **Agency Update**

Alice Doswell, DOE, encouraged attendance at two upcoming workshops. On April 12, a workshop will be held regarding the Performance Management Plan at 5 p.m. On April 13, a Risk Based End State Workshop to be held at 8:30 a.m. Both meetings are being sponsored by

the SRS CAB Strategic & Legacy Management Committee and will be held at the North Augusta Community Center. Ms. Doswell announced that the number of facilities to be decontaminated and decommissioned (D&D) had increased by 200, based on a review of existing criteria, which allowed numerous structures to be identified as stand alone facilities. She also announced that beryllium contamination was discovered in 777-10A from legacy beryllium stored in the facility. Teresa Haas provided a brief update on workforce restructuring, noting that 300 WSRC employees would be laid off in the next week.

Robert Pope, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), discussed the D&D work at SRS and EPA's involvement in this work. He also noted that the cleanup program is moving forward with several areas nearing eligibility for deletion from the National Priorities List. Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC, announced that Robert W. King, Jr. was appointed as Deputy Commissioner for Environmental Quality Control for SCDHEC. James A. Joy was appointed SCDHEC Assistant Deputy Commissioner.

HLWljhlwhlw

### **Public Comment**

No public comments were provided during this portion of the meeting.

### **Chair Update**

Jean Sulc provided an update regarding the Executive Committee meeting held the previous day. She noted the Committee had discussed proper use of the CAB letterhead and agenda development and the need to keep agendas tighter. The committee also received updates on the future CAB administration via an 8A contract. The Executive Committee approved and the Board determined meeting dates for an Educational Retreat in September. Ms. Sulc noted the upcoming SSAB Chairs meeting to be held in April in Washington, D.C. Mel Galin provided an update on the Programmatic Agreement, which was expected to be signed shortly.

### **Facilitator Update**

Mike Schoener presented the Recommendation Summary Report (see attached). Eleven recommendations are pending, 21 open and 152 closed. Mr. Schoener provided an explanation of the report for new members.

### **Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee**

Perry Holcomb encouraged CAB member attendance during a tour of various soil and groundwater projects at SRS on April 20. He also announced the availability of the Comprehensive Cleanup Plan, which will be provided on compact disc to CAB members.

Mary Drye presented the FD&SR Committee draft motion on SRS Environmental Monitoring (see attachment). The draft motion recommended the following regarding environmental monitoring and the annual report:

1. SRS should provide additional and continuing trending analysis, especially for the long-lived, mobile fission products like I-129 and Tc-99, and highlight those in a separate section of the annual SRS Environmental Monitoring Report.

2. SRS should consider making a portion of the semiannual regional monitoring organization meetings open to the public and include presentations directed towards public education about the monitoring data and its impacts.
3. SRS should separate the deer and feral hog surveillance data and report the individual radiation dose to sportsmen and the general public. The SRS CAB supports this recommendation that comes from an active stakeholder in environmental affairs.
4. SRS should expand its environmental sampling and analysis program to cover both shellfish and bivalves in and around the mouth of the Savannah River and its coastal area. A presentation to the CAB of the technical requirements, potential merits, and cost estimates for such a program is requested by July 26, 2004. This recommendation is offered as a result of previous contacts with the CAB by residents of Savannah, GA.
5. SRS consider preparing the CD-ROM that accompanies the annual Environmental Report in such formats as to permit both PC and Macintosh users to be able to easily open and read files, such as .exe, which are now only available to the former.

Bill Vogeles moved the Board adopt the motion and Murray Riley seconded. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.

### **Waste Management Committee**

Harold Rahn presented a draft motion regarding a High Level Waste Proposal (see attached). He summarized issues regarding the proposal, primarily adequate funding and the withholding of set aside funds that seriously impact the HLW disposition schedule and impacts of the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing lawsuit. Based on DOE's recently released budget request for FY2005, the motion recommended that DOE-HQ reconsider the High Level Waste Proposal and reinstate adequate funding in the SRS budget to permit an aggressive HLW disposition program with measurable progress toward tank closure. It also asked HQ to show how the proposed \$350 million budget is allocated among the three DOE facilities being impacted by the WIR lawsuit. The motion asked HQ to initiate constructive planning, including budgeting for pursuing removal and treatment of HLW from the tanks as well as tank closure based on either of the two eventual outcomes of the WIR lawsuit and asked DOE to work closely with regulators while doing so. Of DOE-SR, the motion requested a list and timelines of HLW activities that are and are not impacted by the WIR lawsuit by May 24, 2004.

Following discussion regarding the differences in the SRS and Hanford high level waste programs, Bill Vogeles moved the Board adopt the motion and Bill Willoughby seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Darryl Nettles presented a second draft motion regarding Transuranic (TRU) Waste Program Acceleration (see attached). The motion asks DOE to provide a schedule demonstrating the design, certification and fabrication of the TRUPACT III shipping containers to meet the SRS 2006 maximum case scope. It also asked DOE to describe the planned method and timetable for implementation of a technology to remediate, assay, and X-ray large containers. The motion requested that DOE share its determination on the availability of the ARROW PAK container and provide a schedule for submitting a modification to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the TRU-PACT II to allow shipments of drum waste with high TRU waste activity. All information was requested by September 27, 2004. The motion also asked that DOE-SR install a



LANL glove box to maintain the increased rate of intrusive repackaging for drum waste. Of DOE-HQ, it asked for assurance that adequate funding is in place to accelerate the removal of legacy TRU waste at SRS by 2006. Following brief discussion, Bill Voegel moved the Board adopt the motion and Mary Drye seconded. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

Jean Sulc presented a draft letter regarding non-technical written comments on the Transuranic Waste Baseline Inventory Report (see attached). This letter is being prepared as comments to the New Mexico Environment Department permit modification regarding the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

### **Strategic & Legacy Management Committee**

Charlie Anderson, DOE Deputy Manager for Cleanup provided a briefing on the SRS EM Performance Management Plan (PMP) Revision (see attached). The objective of the briefing was to provide stakeholders with DOE's plans to revise the PMP and the key planning assumptions being used in the revision. The PMP was developed in response to EM's Top to Bottom Report. It focused on initiatives that could drastically improve cleanup time and reduce EM's liability. Because the original PMP was initiative-based, it did not encompass all scope to complete the EM mission at SRS, for example D&D was limited to T, D, and M areas only and the PMP assumed transition of major facilities to other DOE program offices. Advancements have been made in site programs and planning. New scope acceleration objectives were negotiated into the M&O contract; an Integrated Deactivation and Decommissioning plan was issued; a Draft Risk Based End State (RBES) Vision is being developed; and several key programmatic issues have evolved since 2002, including the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing impacts. These significant changes and new programmatic drivers warrant a revision of SR's PMP, said Anderson. The revised PMP will serve as the comprehensive EM cleanup plan and lifecycle scope, cost and schedule. It will be integrated with the RBES vision initiative and will also serve as SR's basis for outyear budget submission, EM Gold Metric profiles and as a planning tool for future contracts. Mr. Anderson explained how the PMP will be projectized by new Project Baseline Summary structure, therefore being consistent with how SRS receives funding.

Key planning assumptions include health and safety of the public, workers, and the environment; all compliance agreements and other regulatory commitments will be met; scope includes all activities required to complete the EM Cleanup Project at SRS; EM mission completion target is 2025; and the use of current funding profile as the initial target. Other planning assumptions are that SRS will remain under federal control; there will be no transfer of EM facilities to another program office within the planning window and in 2026, long term stewardship activities and costs will be funded either through the Office of Legacy Management or other Headquarters program offices. Mr. Anderson discussed key planning assumptions in various programmatic areas and then discussed the schedule for the revised PMP, which is slated for stakeholder review and comment in April.

Discussion revolved around the impacts of the transition to an NNSA site, whether the assumptions were based on accurate information, i.e. is Yucca Mountain really going to open in 2010, and integration of continuing active facilities that may be needed for up to 50 more years.

### **Public Comments**

## **Mary Kelly, South Carolina League of Women Voters**

Ms. Kelly commented that she used to follow committee work and one of the problems in the past was a lack of openness, which has greatly improved. She stated she was impressed by the hard work of the committee. She did comment on the environmental membership of this committee, noting the CAB has environmental members, but they don't represent environmental organizations. She stated there is a big difference and that bothers her. Ms. Kelly said there is no discussion about what is going to be retained at this site for when NNSA comes in to do its work and she was happy the CAB is tuning into the NNSA. Having participated in a number of meetings (NNSA), she noted the public is being short-changed. She noted the long parade of political figures that make public comment and then the public comes in after everyone has gone home. She commented on the need for greater clarification about legislation that has been introduced noting that all are concerned about what waste will remain onsite. She stated information is being dummed down. She closed by thanking the Board for its hard work.

## **Glynn Carroll, GANE**

Ms. Carrolll stated that GANE was a statewide 25 year old organization with 200 members. She said she felt rewarded by involvement in plutonium disposition motion and wanted GANE to retain a presence. She applauded the January DNFSB report noting it was clear and critical and saw problems with KAMS. DNFSB is a big deal at DOE and never disregarded, she said. Ms. Carroll commented that non-moxable plutonium could be merged with the vitrification plan and that it looks like a good fit. She stated she thought this would be a wonderful decision to make and asked the CAB to please influence this decision. Regarding plutonium disposition, she stated GANE shares the concern of the CAB that DOE is not being forthcoming. She stated it is possible DOE would build the MOX plant, pull the program and produce pits and she fears this is the hidden agenda with the MOX plant. Ms. Carroll commented that she was baffled why there would be an interest in supporting getting rid of the Georgia Environmental Monitoring Program and stated she had a map of all the monitoring stations. She also commented that Jim Hardeman has expressed that he would be highly interested in being an ex-officio member but wants to be invited to participate.

Ms. Carroll commented that Yucca Mountain is far from an assumption that you can count on. She said a key republican was not inclined to continue funding Yucca since serious issues are not being addressed and we need to consider that HLW will not leave SRS any time soon. She stated that the alternative is so controversial- grouting HLW is dismal- not an alternative. Ms. Carroll commented that the CAB is really working hard and putting their minds to huge problems. She stated that although ideologically she feels different, she commends the Board for its thoughtful and deliberate work. She stated she feels well represented by the CAB.

## **Nuclear Materials Committee**

Gerald Devitt announced the next committee meeting will be held April 19 at the Aiken Federal Building. He also announced that Karen Patterson will serve as Vice Chair of the committee. Karen Patterson presented a draft motion regarding plutonium disposition (see attached). The motion asks DOE to provide specific details to the CAB on what options for complex-wide plutonium disposition are being considered. It also asks DOE to prepare a detailed response to

the need for NEPA action or lack thereof, for complex-wide plutonium disposition. Karen Patterson provided a brief history of public involvement in the NEPA process regarding this issue. Bill Willoughby moved the Board adopt the motion and Darryl Nettles seconded. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.

### **Plutonium Safe Storage and Surveillance**

Kerry Dunn, WSRC, provided a presentation on Plutonium Safe Storage and Surveillance (see attached). She discussed two plutonium storage facilities- K Area Materials Storage (KAMS) and 235-F and the storage requirements of each. She discussed the major differences between the functional capabilities of the KAMS and 235-F facilities. Ms. Dunn explained that while both facilities could be used for the receipt, shipment, and storage of Pu, containers would not be opened in KAMS due to ventilation constraints.

Ms. Dunn explained that the specifications for Pu packaging, storage, and surveillance are defined in a DOE Standard 3013 (DOE-STD-3013). Plutonium is put in a safe and stable form through a stabilization process, resulting in a metal button or an oxide powder.

Using props and photographs, Ms. Dunn explained how Pu is placed into a bagless transfer can and then placed into an outer can. For material that is sent to KAMS, the 3013 nested cans are placed into a shipping container which meets the Department of Transportation (DOT) standard known as a DOT certified 9975 storage package. The material shipped to 235-F will remain in 3013 cans but will not require 9975 storage packages unless the material were to be shipped to another location. The DOE-STD-3013 requires that a surveillance program be established for the 3013 containers and the 9975 shipping packages. Ms. Dunn explained that the standard requires a surveillance to be performed initially at the packaging location and then on an on-going basis at the designated storage location.

Ms. Dunn explained the various techniques that are used in the 3013 surveillance program including radiography, weight measurements, and health physics smears. At the current time, workers in FB-Line are stabilizing and packaging Pu in 3013 containers and performing the initial surveillance techniques on containers. Approximately (40) 3013 and 9975 containers per year will be surveyed starting in February 2005.

Discussion revolved around the differences in KAMs and 235-F, ventilation, and shipping versus storage containers. Board members questioned the amount of plutonium limited per container and asked if the plutonium limit that can be stored in 235-F and KAMS is a classified number, which they were told the amount stored is classified. They also questioned tracking systems and inquired about DNFSB concerns about 235-F.

### **Administrative Committee Report**

Perry Holcomb presented a draft amendment to the bylaws (see attached). Board member discussion pursued, however there were not enough appointed Board members in attendance to vote on the amendment, which was postponed until the next bi-monthly business meeting.

### **Public Comments**

Don Kantor, a member of the general public, welcomed new members of the board and noted he

was impressed by today's conversation. He stated he had been following Board activities for some time and look forward to one day serving on the CAB.

## **Handouts**

March 22-23, 2004 CAB Agenda

An Overview of SRS's Environmental Monitoring Program, Jim Heffner, WSRC

SRS Environmental Monitoring Program, Third Draft, Perry Holcomb, CAB

High Level Waste Proposal, Sixth Draft, Harold Rahn, CAB

SRS TRU Waste Program Acceleration, First Draft, Darryl Nettles, CAB

Plutonium Disposition, Working Draft, Gerald Devitt, CAB

Savannah River Site Budget Update, Jim Buice, DOE

SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

SRS Environmental Monitoring Program, Final Draft, Perry Holcomb, CAB

High Level Waste Proposal, Final Draft, Harold Rahn, CAB

SRS TRU Waste Program Acceleration, Final Draft, Darryl Nettles, CAB

Letter to New Mexico Environment Department from Jean Sulc, dated April 6, 2004

SRS EM Performance Management Plan Revision, Charlie Anderson, DOE

Plutonium Disposition, Final Draft, Gerald Devitt, CAB

Plutonium Safe Storage and Surveillance, David Burke, WSRC

Summary of Proposal to Amend the SRS CAB Bylaws, March 23, 2004

SRS CAB Calendar

Letter to Jean Sulc from SCDHEC, dated March 17, 2004

News Articles, dated March 15, 2004, Mel Galin, CAB

SRS's Gold Metrics