



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

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

**North Augusta , SC  
March 28-29, 2005**

#### **Monday, March 28, 2005, Attendance**

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

Meryl Alalof  
Donna Antonucci  
Manuel Bettencourt  
Tracey Carroll  
Leon Chavous  
Gerald Devitt  
Arthur Domby  
Mary Drye  
Cassandra Henry  
Perry Holcomb

##### **Regulators**

Annie Godfrey, EPA  
Charles Gorman, SCDHEC

##### **Stakeholders**

Louis Zeller  
Corliss Derrick  
Jacqueline Miller  
Gary Zimmerman  
Mike French  
Glenn Carroll  
Bobbie Paul  
Ed Wannemacher  
Ranowul Jzar  
Bill Lawless  
William Lawrence  
Wendell Lyon  
Jimmy Mackey  
Robert Meisenheimer  
Joseph Ortaldo  
Karen Patterson  
Barbara Paul  
Jean Sulc  
Carolyn Williams

##### **DOE/Contractors**

Nick Delaplane, DOE  
Jim Buice, DOE  
Gerri Flemming, DOE  
Becky Craft, DOE  
Bert Crapse, DOE  
John Knox, DOE  
George Mishra, DOE  
Randall Ponik, DOE  
Wade Whitaker, DOE  
Michael Graham, Bechtel  
Bruce Schappell, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC  
Joe Carter, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC  
Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC

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

Bill Spader, DOE  
Shelley Sherritt, SCDHEC  
Robert Pope, EPA

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

##### **Draft Artifact Storage and Long-term Records Management Draft Motion**

William Lawrence, draft motion manager, read the comment and recommendation section of the draft motion (see attachment). After much discussion, the comments were incorporated into the motion and it was agreed to present it to the full CAB.

##### **2006 SRS Budget Status**

Jim Buice, DOE Director of the Budget Division, reviewed the fiscal year (FY) 2006 budget status.

Every dollar spent at the site is appropriated by Congress. The fiscal year starts October 1. The funds for FY05 arrived at the site in early December. A continuing resolution was passed to

continue funding from October 1, 2005 through early December. The FY06 budget went to Congress February 7, 2005. The FY07 budget will be sent to DOE-HQ April 15, 2005.

Mr. Buice reviewed the total budget at the site via program. The Environmental Management (EM) program received the most funding at \$1,295 million for FY06. It was noted that the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory (SREL) did not receive funding for FY06.

The various Project Baseline Summaries for the EM projects were reviewed. Mr. Buice pointed out the variances between FY05 and FY06 and stated the reason for the difference. The total difference between 2005 and 2006 is approximately \$20 million.

With the site EM mission to be completed by 2025, the life-cycle end state end dates were reviewed. Some of the significant dates are:

- All Transuranic (TRU) waste to be shipped off site by FY09.
- Complete deactivation of F Canyon in FY06 and H Canyon in FY10.
- Complete shipment of Spent Nuclear Fuel to the Federal Repository by FY20.
- Complete shipment of high-level waste canisters to the Federal Repository by FY19.
- Operationally close all waste tanks by FY20.
- Complete construction of remedies for all waste sites, groundwater and surface water by FY25.
- Complete decommissioning and deactivation by FY25.

Planned accomplishments for FY06 were also reviewed. It was noted that the design basis threat modifications are to be completed by FY08.

### **Nuclear Materials Committee**

Jerry Devitt, Nuclear Materials Committee (NMC) Chair, opened the meeting by stating that DOE had recently presented information about a proposal to move the 3013 surveillance project to 105-K. Based on what the NMC has learned, he said the committee has drafted a motion in support of DOE's proposal and asked Karen Patterson to lead the discussion on this recommendation (see attachment).

As an introduction to the draft recommendation on "The Redirection of 3013 Container Surveillance and Storage Capability (CSSC)", Ms. Patterson explained that the original plans called for plutonium storage in Building 235-F and K Area. She stated that those plans also called for placing the surveillance capability in Building 235-F. The recently revised Design Basis Threat (DBT) guidance resulted in enhanced security requirements that must be met to protect the plutonium from any potential adversary. She reminded them of the earlier Budget presentation, which explained that the costs associated with implementing the required protection levels are significant. The NMC has learned that when feasible, the guidance suggested consolidating the areas that require the increased level of security. As a result, DOE is proposing to consolidate all plutonium storage into K Area. Ms. Patterson concluded that the draft recommendation calls for DOE to provide additional cost information and proceed with gaining congressional approval for this project change. With only minor editorial changes suggested, it was agreed that the draft recommendation would be formally presented at the Board meeting.

On a separate issue, Ms. Patterson reminded those present that at the last NMC meeting she had announced her intention to submit questions to DOE that she and others have generated to help DOE understand exactly the level of detail stakeholders want in regards to plutonium. She encouraged the stakeholders to review the list and to advise her by the end of the Board meeting of any additional questions they may have. At that time, she will take steps to have them submitted to the appropriate DOE office.

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

#### **Soil And Groundwater Closure Projects**

Wade Whitaker , DOE Director of Soil and Groundwater Projects (SGP) stated that the purpose of the presentation (see attachment) was to introduce himself and the Bechtel Savannah River Incorporated (BSRI) Senior Management for SGP and to provide an update on the Program's cleanup activities. The goal of SGP is to cleanup waste sites and groundwater to reduce risk to human health and the environment while meeting regulatory commitments. Mr. Whitaker pointed out that the site has 515 waste sites of which 316 are completed and 49 are in remedial design. In addition, there are 11 major groundwater contamination areas. Mr. Whitaker stated that public involvement is active at SRS and works due to close coordination with the SCDHEC and EPA. Mr. Whitaker stated that the main impetus of the program is to achieve area completions by streamlining characterizations, assessments and remediation, and working closely with EPA and SCDHEC through an integrated area completion organizational structure. The T-Area will be the first area closure for SRS and is expected in FY06.

Michael Graham introduced himself as the area project manager of SGP and explained his organization to the meeting attendees. Mr. Graham stated that safety was the first priority as people are the most important resource. He pronounced his organization as comprised of high performance teams, where stakeholder satisfaction is a continuous focus, project management systems are rigorously used and long range strategic planning is valued. Mr. Graham pointed out that in the past SGP spent over half their time in characterization and remediation, today that is minimized and operations, monitoring and administration and documentation is the time consumer, which requires DOE and regulator support. The future will be comprised of integrated whole area completions, operational area completions, streamlined administration, essential monitoring and leveraging our understanding.

Bruce Schappell introduced himself as the assistant area project manager of SGP and explained some of the unique activities at SRS in the area of soil and groundwater remediation. T-Area will be turned over as complete in FY06, which consisted of cleanup of five waste units and management of the slabs that resulted from decommissioning activities in addition to an engineered cap over the TNX burial ground and contaminated areas.

The general separations area consolidation units' project will move 45,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil to the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground. The dynamic underground stripping project injects steam into the soil to volatilize solvents to be extracted in order to reduce the source contamination at that area. This technology is the largest of its kind in the DOE complex.

The F&H Groundwater project uses innovative technology which creates an underground barrier wall which impedes the migration of tritium to the groundwater. The Reactor Seepage Basins, the Chemical, Metals and Pesticides Pits are other areas at the SRS where innovation saves time and schedule. Mr. Schappell concluded the presentation with the following list of units, which will be coming up for public input:

T-Area Proposed Plan in early spring of 2005

Miscellaneous Rubble Pile Removal Action Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis in April 2005

211-FB Plutonium Statement of Basis / Proposed Plan (SB/PP) in October 2005

A-Area Burning and Rubble Pile / Metals Burning Pits SB/PP in December 2005

M-Area Settling Basin Inactive Process Sewer Lines SB/PP in January 2006

L-Area Southern Groundwater SB/PP in May of 2006

Bob Meisenheimer asked if there is a schedule that documents all the projects referred to in the presentation. Mr. Schappell stated that the schedule is in the Federal Facility Agreement. Joe Ortaldo asked if the word completion meant nothing else is done on a given project. Mr. Schappell stated that the word completion in SGP means that physical completion of the cleanup is done however there may be institutional controls such as monitoring in place for years into the future. Bill Lawless asked how flexible the site is in regards to accelerating the schedule. Mr. Schappell stated that the site is flexible in pulling in the schedule to save money if it can demonstrate it is reducing risk.

### **Waste Management Committee**

Bob Meisenheimer, Waste Management Committee (WMC) Chair, opened the meeting by introducing DOE's Bert Crapse. He said Bert would be providing a brief presentation as background information to assist those present in discussing the two draft recommendations that were the primary topic of the meeting.

Mr. Crapse began his presentation (see attachment) by detailing the TRU Program goals for shipping SRS TRU waste to WIPP. He said the ability to accomplish these goals lies in the successful management of the waste by container type and to keep the National TRU Waste Program focused on the site's needs. He explained that the type of waste and the type of container set the schedule for TRU waste. While there are several keys to meeting this schedule, most are tied to meeting shipping criteria according to Mr. Crapse.

He detailed the steps in TRU waste handling and stated that much of the earlier efforts had been focused on waste that had been relatively easy to handle. He said the next phase of handling drummed waste will be more difficult and also requires special facilities. If during a prescreen x-ray of waste any non-compliant drums are identified, the drums are not characterized until they are repackaged. Mr. Crapse said of the almost 12,000 drums of low activity waste left at SRS, about 5000 will require repackaging and approximately 3000 require venting.

Mr. Crapse explained that the non-drummed waste will also require a prescreen x-ray and the removal of prohibited items. He said depending on the size and the issue relative to the waste; a special technology or building may be needed to get into the large boxes. For this reason, a plan

is needed for repackaging and characterizing this waste as well as appropriate WIPP approved shipping containers. Mr. Crapse concluded his presentation by saying that the success of dispositioning the non-drummed waste at SRS was dependent on the resolution of the following key issues :

- WIPP Certifiable Characterization System for large boxes
- Repackaging and Prohibited Items Removal Facilities
- Licensing of the TRUPACT II

Joe Ortaldo introduced the "TRU Waste Issues" recommendation (see attachment) with a reminder of the past success that the SRS CAB has had in influencing national TRU Waste policy. He referenced a past SRS CAB recommendation that was acted upon by Senator Domenici of New Mexico. It resulted in Public Law 108-387. Mr. Ortaldo said that the draft recommendation he was presenting provided support for the licensing and operational deployment of shipping containers that would also have a national impact. He further explained that the availability of these containers was critical to the success of meeting the schedule for shipping SRS TRU Waste to WIPP. After a brief discussion of the merits of the recommendation, Mr. Ortaldo stated the recommendation would be presented at the next day's Board meeting.

Manuel Bettencourt introduced the second draft recommendation (see attachment) on "SRS Non-drummed TRU Waste". He explained that this recommendation called for DOE to accelerate the approval of a non-drummed certification process. He said the recommendation is calling for SRS to continue to repackage non-drummed TRU waste so that a supply of packages is ready when the TRUPACT-III is certified. The recommendation was discussed and after minor changes, it was agreed that it would be presented for a vote at the Board meeting.

Bob Meisenheimer concluded the meeting by announcing that the Waste Determination Document would soon be available for public comment. He said this document was critical to the restart of tank closures. He said the WMC would be carefully studying the document and future recommendations may result.

### **Public Comments**

Karen Patterson noted she had a letter regarding public involvement in National Nuclear Security Administration issues and encouraged all in attendance to sign the letter.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

### **Tuesday, March 29, 2005, Attendance**

#### **SRS CAB Members**

Meryl Alalof  
Donna Antonucci  
Manuel Bettencourt

#### **Stakeholders**

Louis Zeller  
Joe Whetstone  
Liz Goodson

#### **DOE/Contractors**

Jeff Allison, DOE  
Nick Delaplane, DOE  
Kevin Smith, DOE

Tracey Carroll  
Leon Chavous  
Gerald Devitt  
Arthur Domby  
Mary Drye  
Cassandra Henry  
Perry Holcomb  
Ranowul Jzar

**Regulators**

Annie Godfrey, EPA  
Charles Gorman, SCDHEC  
John Contardi, DNFSB

Gary Zimmerman  
Mike French  
Glenn Carroll  
Phyllis Britt  
Murray Riley  
Walt Joseph  
Charles Utley  
Bill Lawless  
William Lawrence  
Wendell Lyon  
Jimmy Mackey  
Robert Meisenheimer  
Joseph Ortaldo  
Karen Patterson  
Barbara Paul  
Jean Sulc  
Carolyn Williams  
Bill Willoughby

Gerri Flemming, DOE  
Becky Craft, DOE  
John Knox, DOE  
George Mishra, DOE  
Randall Ponik, DOE  
Bob Pedde, WSRC  
Jack Devine, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC  
Joe Carter, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC  
Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC  
Mary Beth Berry, USFS

**Ex-Officio Members**

Bill Spader, DOE  
Shelley Sherritt, SCDHEC  
Robert Pope, EPA

SRS CAB members Danielle Mackie, Dorene Richardson and Gloria Williams-Way were unable to attend. The meeting opened with Bill Spader, DOE, serving as Designated Federal Official. Mike Schoener served as facilitator and Rick McLeod, Board Technical Advisor was present as well. The meeting was open to the public and posted in the Federal Register in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

**Approval of the Minutes**

The meeting minutes of January 24-25, 2005, were approved with one minor change.

**Agency Update**

Bill Spader, DOE, introduced Jeff Allison who welcomed the new CAB members to the Board and provided brief remarks regarding the End State Vision. Bill Spader confirmed that CAB new member appointment letters were signed. He also noted the accomplishment of FB Line, which was deinventoried. He also noted DOE-SR would hold off on the final submittal of the End State Vision to allow for the CAB to make a recommendation in May. Mr. Spader provided the Draft Community Involvement Plan for comments and asked that any comments be provided in the next two weeks. Mr. Spader also noted the Federal Facility Agreement Appendix E submittal, due March 31. He commented on DOE-SR plans to recompet the site contract and noted that CAB Administration is a component of the contract. He invited CAB input on CAB administration as DOE moves forward with the recompetition. Mr. Spader called on Bob Pedde, WSRC President to give a summary of the workforce restructuring under way at SRS. A self select option was offered and 622 volunteered to leave. All were accepted to minimize impact on workforce. Another 178 individuals will be notified in mid-April of involuntary separation.

Robert Pope, EPA, noted that EPA has made a concerted effort to be present at CAB meetings and is committed to continue attending meetings. He also noted that EPA is working well with DOE and SCDHEC on Appendix E and it will address many concerns. He commented that a

new Appendix K will list all the facilities that are undergoing D&D at SRS. Appendix K-2 will list facilities for no further action. Other facilities that need action will be referred to a new area in Appendix C.

Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC, welcomed the new CAB members. She also provided SCDHEC's perspective on high level waste disposition. The main goals are to see the tanks closed quickly. There is high risk associated with them and SCDHEC wants to see it reduced. She provided a letter (see attachment) from DOE that outlines DOE's conceptual approach for high level waste disposition. Ms. Sherritt commented that SCDHEC has no firm role in waste determination, but will be looking at it. Ms. Sherritt noted an upcoming National Academies of Science meeting of the committee on certain tank wastes and spoke about how the public can be involved in this meeting on April 13-14, 2005. She said SCDHEC hopes to see recommendations for improvements in the process, in technology, and in characterization- their best scientific advice on high level waste disposition.

### ***Public Comments***

#### **Gary Zimmerman**

Mr. Zimmerman commented that sometimes in documents like the gold metrics that list only volume, it gives a misleading impression of what's been accomplished. He noted that curies should be shown as well as volume.

#### **Lou Zeller, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League (BREDL)**

Mr. Zeller read the mission of the SRS CAB and respectfully requested that in its capacity as advisor, the Board transmit (attached) recommendations to the agencies. Mr. Zeller read the attached statement.

#### **Glenn Carroll, Georgians Against Nuclear Energy**

Ms. Carroll provided an update on MOX waste. She stated that now the evaluation is out. She also commented that DOE suspended the Waste solidification building in 2005 and when GANE filed a contention that said this was not cool, they delayed construction until 2006. She said GANE put in a contention that NEPA requires that you know how this is going to go down and you have to say what the plan is. GANE's contention was dismissed on its merits and she said she would have to tell why later. Ms. Carroll also commented that she got a little feedback from Hilton Head that the Environmental Management charter does not allow the CAB to use precautionary measures until there is a problem. She also commented on the NAS meeting and that GANE was not in agreement with the CAB's position on waste determination.

#### **Joe Whetstone, Bluffton, S.C.**

Mr. Whetstone commented that in November of 2004, Shelly Sherritt of SCDHEC sent the following answer in response to a question concerning the closure date for SRS HLW tanks. DHEC Response: The next two tanks in line for closure are Tanks 19F and 18F. The closure date for Tank 19F is October 31, 2006 and the closure date for Tank 18F is February 28, 2007. The current schedule for grouting the two tanks is starting the summer of '06 and ending in February of '07.

Based on the information that Shelly provided in response to Mr. Whetstone's question, he asked could the CAB provide or encourage DOE to provide answers to the following questions concerning the HLW tanks?

- Since the dates for the closure of tanks 19 and 18 appear to be in place, does DOE plan to remove any additional waste from tanks 19 and 18 before they start the grouting process?

Assuming waste removal for tanks 19 and 18 is complete:

- What was the date waste removal was complete for each tank?
- Is a final radionuclide waste inventory listing available for each tank?
- If so, how does the public get a copy?
- How were the final radionuclide waste inventory figures arrived at?
- If an inventory is not available, when will it be available?
- There was a before cleaning and after cleaning picture of tank 20. Will there be similar pictures for tanks 19 and 18?
- If waste removal from tanks 19 and 18 is not complete, what is the expected cleaning completion date for each tank?

### **Facilitator Update**

Mike Schoener presented the Recommendation Summary Report (see attached). Four recommendations are pending, 26 open and 175 closed.

### **Nuclear Materials Committee**

Karen Patterson presented a draft motion on the Redirection of CSSC from 235-F to 105 K (see attachment). The draft motion recommended that DOE-SR verify the cost estimates for the 3013 CSSC Project in 105-K and provide documentation to demonstrate that there are considerable cost savings over performing these functions in Building 235-F and present this information to the SRS CAB on or before May 26, 2005. It also asked DOE to obtain Congressional approval to begin design of the 3013 CSSC Project in 105K and petition Congress as soon as possible to reallocate these funds. Jimmy Mackey moved the Board approve the motion and William Lawrence seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 22 members in favor.

### **Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board**

John Contardi, DNFSB, provided a presentation on the DNFSB perspective on nuclear material stabilization and storage. He also outlined the Board's statutory oversight mission and general operational structure as well. In the late 1980's due to erosion in Congressional confidence in DOE's ability to ensure the safety of operations in the Nuclear Weapons Complex through self regulation alone coupled with Congressional reluctance to subject national security interests to external regulation, the DNFSB was formed for independent oversight. The DNFSB mission is to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy to ensure adequate health and safety protection for the public and workers. There are five Board members that are recognized nuclear safety experts. No more than three members can be from the same political party. The DNFSB reviews and evaluates standards; analyzes design and operations and reviews facility design and construction and makes recommendations. The DNFSB Budget is \$18 million and there are 100 employees.



In the last three years, DNFSB has conducted 22 reviews of SRS spent fuel storage, plutonium storage and separations. Several related letters have been provided including two reports to Congress on plutonium storage, canyon utilization and safety basis. Spent Fuel has been consolidated at SRS into L-Basin and DNFSB really does not have any issues with spent fuel storage at SRS, the issues arise with disposition in the deep geologic repository, said Contardi.

Mr. Contardi also discussed plutonium storage and canyon utilization. The current DOE strategy for plutonium disposition is to continue storage of Type B containers in KAMs, with limited extent surveillance in F Area. The plan is to install storage, stabilization, packaging, and surveillance equipment in K Area. Mr. Contardi stated that current storage in KAMS is safe, at least for the interim. The DNFSB did make a few recommendations for safety. He noted that SRS had delivered a plutonium storage study to DOE-HQ and the DNFSB had questioned some of the assumptions and scope of study. A new storage study is being developed. Regarding canyon utilization, Mr. Contardi noted Recommendation 94-1 and 00-1. He noted that canyon utilization through the current contract is well defined and funded. He discussed "orphaned" materials under EM and NNSA and some slightly irradiated nuclear materials that are suited for dissolution in the canyons.

Mr. Contardi summarized stating that SNF Storage in L Basin is adequate. However, long term wet storage is not the answer. DOE needs to develop and implement a disposition path. Consolidation of plutonium in KAMS appears safer and more feasible than use of F Area facilities. Pu vitrification and spent fuel disposal require major development, design and construction efforts. Recently, DOE has a poor track record for new disposition paths. He concluded that canyon utilization offers near-term risk reduction, a known safety envelope, and known costs.

Board members questioned if DNFSB is reviewing the Waste Determination Document and asked for any comments DNFSB might have. Other questions revolved around the Design Basis Threat requirements, which is not within the purview of DNFSB.

### **F Canyon Update**

Bob McQuinn, WSRC, provided a presentation on the F Area Closure Project (see attachment). The purpose of his presentation was to provide a six month progress report for the F Area deactivation in response to CAB Recommendation #184. Mr. McQuinn provided background and history of the F Area Complex, discussing the F Canyon Purex Process and FB Line Plutonium refining and finishing process. Mr. McQuinn discussed solvent disposition, depleted uranyl nitrate disposition, depleted uranium oxide disposition, and final plutonium packaging and stabilization. FB Line shipped the last Category 3 plutonium to 235-F on February 25, 2005. It was downgraded to a Category 4 facility on March 1, 2005, and is no longer a Property Protection Area. A security presence is no longer required.

Mr. McQuinn discussed decommissioning planning and stated SRS is about a year away from achieving deactivation end points. Some elevators and canyon cranes were left so that they could be used during D&D activities. WSRC F Closure Project is now completing radiological surveys in the hot and warm canyon. When the decommissioning planning begins, an environmental performance assessment will be conducted to define residual radioisotope source term limits. Mr.

McQuinn concluded that the F Area Closure mission is being accomplished safely and cost effectively and legacy hazards from the weapon production mission are being eliminated.

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

Perry Holcomb asked Mary Drye to present the committee's draft motion on planning and scheduling to complete SRS cleanup. The Board is concerned about the large number of remedial starts of waste units facing SRS in the out-years (approximately 40% of the sites being started in the last five years) and the uneven sequencing of action starts. The SRS CAB believes that a more consistent leveling-out of the amount of work and associated funding is needed. Therefore, the motion recommended that DOE-SR demonstrate to the SRS CAB on or before September 26, 2005, that proper planning and coordination between the three parties are taking place so that consensus on operational, logistical, and financial details will be reached to assure completion of cleanup activities at the SRS by 2025. It also requested planned out-year schedules and cost estimates for SRS cleanup showing how the planned work activities and their sequencing can continue to find cost-savings and identify processes to accelerate the 2025 date for cleanup completion. Jimmy Mackey moved the Board adopt the motion and Bill Lawless seconded. The motion was adopted unanimously with 23 members in favor.

### ***Public Comments***

#### **Gary Zimmerman**

Mr. Zimmerman commented that the CAB should consider having a formal definition of what a long time is and what a very long time is. Some things you are talking are forever, which would be more accurate, he stated.

#### **Lou Zeller, BREDL**

Mr. Zeller commented that he was rudely interrupted for no good reason at the earlier public comment session and completed reading his written statement (attached).

#### **Glenn Carroll**

Ms. Carroll read a prepared statement from Bobbie Paul of Women's Actions for New Directions (see attachment). Ms. Carroll also commented on Georgia environmental monitoring and that Georgia has no formal relationship with SRS or DOE.

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

#### **Savannah River Ecology Laboratory**

Whit Gibbons of the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory provided a presentation on some of the species at SRS including the Tiger Salamander, Spotted Salamander, the Mole Salamander and the Marble Salamander. According to Mr. Gibbons, SREL has two products- students and scientific technical information. He discussed Carolina Bays and the trapping systems for capturing and identifying animals. Last year 104 salamanders were captured, 1100 Tiger Salamanders were captured, and several thousand Mole Salamanders. The environment provides a dynamic situation for studying the salamander. One isolated wetland produced 1.4 kilotons of amphibians last year. There are more salamanders than deer or birds, a hidden biodiversity. SRS has over 400 Carolina Bays. Mr. Gibbons discussed the importance of SREL as a learning

environment for students and the fact that the site is protected land unlike any you can find elsewhere.

Karen Patterson presented a draft letter in support of restoring funding for SREL, a vital resource to this country and this CAB (see attachment). The Board agreed to send the letter to DOE.

### **Historic Preservation Annual Report**

John Knox, DOE, provided a presentation on the SRS Cold War Built Environment Preservation Annual Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2004 (see attachment). The report is available online. The National Historic Preservation Act requires all Federal agencies consider the impacts to historic properties in all undertakings. DOE has inventoried 732 facilities constructed between 1950 and 1989 and 233 structures are considered historic. Eleven properties are individually eligible for historic preservation. The Programmatic Agreement requires a Cultural Resources Management Plan to be developed for management of SRS Cold War historic properties. WSRC is responsible for implementing the preservation program. Mr. Knox discussed the completed goals of preservation, curation, heritage tourism and public outreach. He discussed compliance activities, challenges and recommendations for improvement. A dynamic D&D schedule coupled with a developing historical preservation process caused difficulty in scheduling artifact selection walk-throughs and other mitigation efforts. Another challenge is that the current artifact storage location does not fully meet curation standards of Title 30 CFR Part 79. Mr. Knox concluded by noting that the SRS Cold War Historic Preservation effort has had a successful start with the completion of the Programmatic Agreement, completion of the first Annual Summary Report, completion of the CRMP and the establishment of an artifact selection team and heritage tourism team.

William Lawrence presented a draft motion regarding SRS Artifacts Storage and Long-term Records Management (see attachment). The motion was regarding the climate and temperature curation needs for artifacts; requested a flow chart describing the process for integrating historical preservation activities; requested a formal presentation on the transfer of SRS programmatic functions and records management to Legacy Management and asked that as national security issues allow, DOE continue to provide public access to historical data through Internet access, via the SRS web site. It also requested that DOE expand the Cold War Cultural Resources Management Plan to include all eligible historic properties and not restrict the eligibility to only Cold War designated facilities and properties. The motion requested that DOE ensure that the SRS Records Administration interacts with the Artifact Selection Team and the SRS Cold War Heritage Team and assure that historical artifacts and records receive certified archival input and oversight. Finally, it asked of DOE-HQ that they ensure the public is included as members of any Local Stakeholders Organization associated with a DOE site through congressional legislation, starting with Rocky Flats, and that they have access to all available public records. Jimmy Mackey moved the board adopt the motion and Bill Willoughby seconded. The motion passed unanimously with 22 members in favor.

### **Waste Management Committee**

Joe Ortaldo presented the draft motion on SRS Transuranic Waste Issues (see attachment). On December 6, 2004, WSRC suspended the transuranic waste processing at the Solid Waste Management Facility in response to safety issues regarding unvented TRU waste drums. Now

that the flammability issues have been addressed and phased shipments have begun (with more stringent safeguards to protect workers, the public and the environment) the motion recommended that DOE accelerate the TRU waste drum shipments to WIPP to meet the FY05 gold metric baseline goal of 168 shipments if possible and in any case, ensure that all legacy low activity drummed waste is shipped by November 2006. It also requested a status report by the next Board meeting. The motion recommended that DOE accelerate the licensing and operational deployment of the TRUPACT III to meet the original delivery date at SRS of October 2007 or earlier and that DOE accelerate the licensing and operational deployment of the ARROWPAK to ensure shipment of all high activity drummed TRU waste by FY 08. It also asked DOE-SR to notify DOE-Carlsbad of the Board's support for Public Law 108-137 and ask that New Mexico Environment Department use operational experience to revise the WIPP-WAC to discard those criteria that do not reduce risks to workers, the public and the environment.

Bill Lawless moved the Board adopt the motion and Jimmy Mackey seconded. The motion passed unanimously with 22 members in favor.

Manuel Bettencourt presented the draft motion on SRS Non-Drummed Transuranic Waste (see attachment). The motion asked that DOE accelerate the non-drummed certification process so that an approved program for TRUPACT-III package certification is in place well before October 2007. It also requested that SRS continue to repackage non-drummed TRU waste so a supply of packages prepared for TRUPACT-III certification and shipment is ready before October 2007. Jimmy Mackey moved the Board adopt the motion and Mary Drye seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 22 members in favor.

### **Administrative Committee Report**

Meryl Alalof presented the SRS CAB Budget, noting expenses through February 2005 (see attachment).

### **Chair Update**

Jean Sulc noted that the Executive Committee had reviewed a letter on the contract competition at SRS. The letter would be redrafted and provided prior to the next meeting, she said.

Ms. Sulc also provided a trip report on the recent visit of six CAB members to Yucca Mountain and the Nevada Test Site. She provided a summary regarding both locations. Trip participants provided comments on the visit as well. Donna Antonucci commented on the importance of public involvement and the appreciation she gained for the Yucca Mountain project. Bob Meisenheimer showed a diagram of the Repository Disposal Concept and described the repository to help the CAB visualize the mountain ridge. He described the physical location of Yucca Mountain and described the surrounding area as well. Mr. Meisenheimer also discussed some of the technical aspects of the program and discussed the current status of the repository. Barbara Paul noted her concerns with fault lines at Yucca Mountain, but stated she doesn't think this is a real issue, based on seismic studies. Her second concern is water seepage. She also discussed her concerns regarding the Native American Tribes at Yucca Mountain.

### ***Public Comments***

**Glenn Carroll, GANE**

Ms. Carroll commented that it interests her that Yucca gets brought up at every single meeting, since so little of SRS problem will be handled by Yucca. She noted she is talking about getting together, the critics and the CAB WM Committee and she would come with an open mind on Yucca Mountain. She commented that the critics and the CAB really need to get to know each other better.

Ms. Carroll also commented on Georgia not responding to an invitation to participate in the CAB. She stated that would not give GA the official status that SCDHEC enjoys. The Georgia Environment Protection Department has no regulatory authority over SRS. She noted she is feeling the absence of an official role between GA and SRS, noting Georgians get good jobs, but also get fallout and have no official status.

**Handouts**

SRS CAB January 24-25, 2005 Agenda

SRS Artifact Storage and Long-term Records Management, Third Draft, William Lawrence, CAB

SRS Environmental Management FY2006 Budget Briefing, Jim Buice, DOE

Redirection of 3013 Container Surveillance and Storage Capability, Third Draft, Karen Patterson, CAB

Planning and Scheduling to Complete SRS Cleanup, Second Draft, Perry Holcomb, CAB

Soil & Groundwater Closure Projects, Wade Whitaker, DOE

TRU Waste Disposition, Bert Crapse, DOE

SRS Non-drummed TRU Waste, Third Draft, Joe Ortaldo, CAB

SRS TRU Waste Issues, Fifth Draft, Manuel Bettencourt, CAB

SRS Gold Metrics

SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

Redirection of 3013 Container Surveillance and Storage Capability, Final Draft, Karen Patterson, CAB

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, John Contardi, DNFSB

F Area Closure Project, Bob McQuinn, WSRC

An Overview of the SRS Cold War Built Environment Preservation, John Knox, DOE

Letter to Paul Golan regarding SREL Funding, Karen Patterson, CAB

SRS Artifact Storage and Long-term Records Management, Final Draft, William Lawrence, CAB

Planning and Scheduling to Complete SRS Cleanup, Final Draft, Perry Holcomb, CAB

SRS Non-drummed TRU Waste, Final Draft, Joe Ortaldo, CAB

SRS TRU Waste Issues, Final Draft, Manuel Bettencourt, CAB

SRS CAB Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Summary

Letter to Robert W. King, SCDHEC, dated January 27, 2005

SRS CAB Calendar

NEPA EIS Report