



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

### **SRS Citizens Advisory Board Strategic and Legacy Management Committee Meeting Summary North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, SC October 26, 2004**

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Strategic and Legacy Management (SLM) Committee held a meeting on October 26, 5:00 p.m., at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, SC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Risk Based End State (RBES) Vision Document status and hear public comment. Those in attendance were:

<b>CAB Members</b>	<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>DOE/Contractors</b>
William Lawrence*	Rick McLeod	Doug Hintze, DOE
Meryl Alalof*	Tracy Punshon, CRESP	Roger Rollins, DOE
Wendell Lyon*		Tony Polk, DOE
Jean Sulc		Bert Crapse, DOE
Murray Riley		Brian Hennessey, DOE
Bill Willoughby		Bill Taylor, DOE
Perry Holcomb		George Mishra, DOE
Mary Drye		Helen Belencan, DOE
Bob Meisenheimer	<b>Regulators</b>	John Gladden, SRNL
Leon Chavous	Robert Pope, EPA	Jim Cook, SRNL
		Mike Nelson, WSRC
		Ron Campbell, WSRC
		Bob Pride, BSRI
		Jim Moore, WSRC

\* Members of the SLM Committee

\*\* Mel Galin, Carolyne Williams, Gloria Williams Way, and Bill Vogele, members of the SLM Committee were unable to attend.

William Lawrence, SLM Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. Mr. Lawrence introduced the speaker.

#### **Risk Based End State Vision Document Status:**

Tony Polk, DOE Director, Soils and Groundwater Project, in reviewing the RBES accomplishments mentioned the early 2003 involvement with the CAB and regulators about the RBES process. The first draft SRS RBES Vision was distributed March 31, 2004. The stakeholders gave valuable comments and the CAB adopted recommendation #190. The regulators acknowledged the RBES Vision but have not officially endorsed it.

At the RBES Next Steps Workshop held by the National Governors Association and DOE, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 4 participated as well as members of South

Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) and various stakeholders. Feedback from the Workshop is expected to be received around November 5. Both the SRS stakeholders and the Workshop input will be included, as appropriate, in the submittal of the final draft of the RBES Vision document by December 1.

It was impressed upon that this current version of the RBES Vision document for SRS is not the end. This is just a framework for continuing dialogue. Mr. Polk reviewed the SRS Site Manager's comments that were given at the Workshop. Some of the comments were:

- SRS developed a tailored approach to implementing policy and guidance.
- Land use at SRS is non-residential and will have perpetual federal ownership.
- The planned end states are already risk-based.
- The site values comments from the stakeholders and will continue to work with the regulators.

Driving the variances in the RBES Vision Document is the effort to reduce risk to the public, workers and the environment, the future use of the entire site, regulatory drivers and stewardship requirements. The site continues to support further public outreach on risk in general and involve stakeholders and regulators as the site moves from Vision to implementation.

In looking at the variances in the RBES, the future land use and exposure scenario modifications variance was discussed. During discussions on the industrial versus trespasser scenario, Robert Pope, EPA, stated that for areas away from the boarder of the site the industrial scenario made sense while some areas around the boundary of the site would have trespasser scenario since it would be harder for the site to patrol the boundaries. Since the industrial scenario is more stringent, that scenario would cover trespassers. On the issue of the time frame considered both on the site and at a federal repository – in perpetuity versus 10,000 years, Mr. Pope stated that many sites had been cleaned up based on the National Priority List and he didn't think the courts would overturn the many thousands of sites already cleaned up.

Bert Crapse, DOE, stated that for the alternate disposal for Pu-238 contaminated transuranic (TRU) waste variance, the current emphasis is to ship all TRU waste containers that currently meet the WIPP waste acceptance criteria. After the completion of that work, then an emphasis would be placed on the high activity Pu-238 TRU waste stream. He indicated that would occur in Fiscal Year 2007 and 2008.

During discussions of the in situ decommissioning instead of demolition variance, it was discussed that in situ would be far less costly but the concern of source removal/reduction needed to be discussed with the public.

The variance on increased high-level waste in Defense Waste Processing Facility canister loading was emphasized. There is reluctance at this time to increase the loading of canisters greater than the Yucca Mountain acceptance criteria. Any requested change could delay startup of Yucca Mountain. The site would rather be shipping material before any changes are considered.

During discussion, some of the following comments were made and responded to:

- There was concern that the SRS CAB did not have anyone participating in the Chicago Workshop. It was explained that during the SSAB Chairs conference call preceding the Workshop, there was discussion that because of the total numbers and the fact that the CAB Chairs and Vice-Chairs would be in Hanford, the Chairs agreed that only a few members of the various CABs would attend the meeting and then distribute their notes on the outcome of the meeting.
- The use of variance and alternate end state was confusing in the document. Mr. Polk explained that the confusion existed around the complex. The final version would not refer to variance but would refer to alternate end states.

Mr. Polk emphasized that the RBES Vision is a framework for continuing dialog.

**Public Comment:**

With no public comments, the meeting was adjourned.

**Action Item:**

The following were the action items. These were submitted by Jean Sulc on October 27 to be included in her comment section of the rating sheet. Ms. Sulc was interested in making sure these items were not dropped during discussions in 2005. The specific Public Involvement folks will follow up.

- It would be useful to also have a more detailed "progress"/status of work on the variances: Especially #2 Alternate Disposition for Pu238 Contaminated TRU Waste. – L. Broussard
- On #3, what areas have moved towards (decisions to do) in situ or other? – P. Sauerborn
- Other – Last Board meeting Bert Crapes commented he would share a TRU Waste Disposition Path Graphic with us. (For Bill Lawless) – L. Broussard