

SRS Citizens Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2005
N. Charleston, S.C.

Monday, November 14, 2005, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

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

Bill Lawless
William Lawrence
Wendell Lyon
Jimmy Mackey
Robert Meisenheimer
Joseph Ortaldo
Karen Patterson
Dorene Richardson
Jean Sulc
Gloria Williams Way
Bill Willoughby

Regulators

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC

Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE
Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC
Albert Frazier, GADNR
Dawn Taylor, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Nick Delaplane, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
Randall Ponik, DOE
deLisa Bratcher, DOE
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Joe Carter, WSRC
Sonny Goldston, WSRC

Waste Management Committee

Yucca Mountain Environmental Protection Agency Revised Standards

Committee Chair Bob Meisenheimer presented a draft letter to EPA regarding revised standards on Yucca Mountain (see attachment). The letter formalized the comments made by Bob Meisenheimer during the October 11 public hearing held in Washington, D.C. It states the SRS CAB position regarding the proposed standards. EPA revised the standards regarding seismology and the environment and proposed a standard of 350 mrem a year for the 10,000 + years at Yucca Mountain. The standard up to 10,000 years is 25 mrem. Essentially, what EPA said was normal background around Yucca Mountain is 350 mrem per year and the normal background at high elevations in the U.S. is 700 mrem. The delta between the two was used to determine the revised standard. Mr. Meisenheimer summarized the comments of other attendees at the public hearing, the majority of which were not in favor of the revised standards. Board members discussed the use of "firm support" within the letter; the fact that these standards are for analysis used to support approval of Yucca Mountain and the letter does not endorse Yucca Mountain; exposure scenarios and the effects of radiation; and the impact of making public comments before the panel in October. Donna Antonucci suggested CAB members log on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) website and voice support. Bill Lawless suggested that NRC be copied on the letter.

Buried Alpha Waste at SRS

Manuel Bettencourt presented the draft motion regarding buried alpha waste at SRS (see attachment). He summarized the motion noting that the Burial Ground Complex occupies 195 acres in the central section of SRS and is used as a disposal for alpha wastes from SRS activities. Final closure of the ORWBG is in accordance with existing laws and regulations.

Karen Patterson commented that there is no national policy and the Board's recommendation is inappropriate. She suggested striking the recommendations and replacing the terminology. Jimmy Mackey agreed with Karen Patterson. It was determined that since there is no national policy, the title should be changed to 'a potential'.

There was discussion on whether there is or is not a national policy. Bill Lawless quoted Frank Marcinowski, DOE-HQ, as saying there was an unwritten standard policy on alpha waste.

Perry Holcomb pointed out that the first recommendation was related to the DOE sites as a whole but the second and third recommendations were SRS specific. It was suggested an insert be put between one and two stating that the last two applied to SRS. It was suggested that recommendation number two be deleted. Rick McLeod commented that the two recommendations related to SRS were in the recommendation for DOE-HQ information and education.

Bill Spader added that the recommendation might be premature as DOE has not yet received the letter from the SSAB Chairs and is taking no action that would alter what is being done at SR.. He stated that the site was committed to close the ORWBG under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

Jean Sulc noted she planned on abstaining on the vote of the recommendation since she had spoken with DOE-HQ and they did not plan on changing any plans on the pre-70 alpha waste and that they would not reopen/reenter any closed pre-1970 alpha waste unit. It was also noted that the Hanford CAB would not sign the letter and the Site Specific Advisory Board letter had not yet been sent to DOE-HQ. With that, Bob Meisenheimer decided to withdraw the recommendation until the CAB has more definitive information. Rick McLeod will place all the changes in the draft recommendation for review at the January CAB meeting.

Draft Waste Determination – Tank 18 and 19

Joe Ortaldo presented the draft recommendation on the Waste Determination on Tank 18 and 19 closures (see attachment). Mr. Ortaldo stated that the bottom line is to get the tanks closed as soon as possible. The recommendation requests NRC and the Department to move forward with the process.

Shelly Sherritt, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC), mentioned the WIR lawsuit is no longer a reason for the delay of closing tank 18 and 19. She indicated that the process of implementation may result in a timetable so long that it may prevent meeting any of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) schedules. While SCDHEC is still supportive of tank closures, it may not be supportive of missing the tank schedules further out. In responding to a question, Ms. Sherritt indicated that SCDHEC could take no action until either the scheduled dates are missed or DOE requests a change in the schedule. In March 2006, the schedule is to be updated. If DOE requests a schedule change, SCDHEC could enter dispute resolution. Penalties are not issued. Perry Holcomb asked if DOE was giving SCDHEC a heads up on what they planned to do. Ms. Sherritt indicated there has been much communication, but they have not heard about a schedule slippage.

Joe Ortaldo presented a proposed draft letter to the Site Manager, Jeff Allison, on the status of SWPF (see attachment). He commented that SWPF was to start up in 2009. The deliquification dissolution adjustment (DDA) is to be available mid-2006 but is just a stop gap. SWPF is the high volume and critical path facility. Recommendation 212 approved in May 2005 requested that DOE keep the CAB informed on the cost and schedule impacts about the design criteria and upgrade of the seismic design but the CAB has not heard back. Karen Patterson requested that DOE give the CAB the information in December so that the recommendation can be developed in January.

A paragraph had been removed from the original letter that Bill Lawless felt took the teeth out of the letter. After discussion, parts of the original paragraph were added to the letter. When asked, Bill Spader indicated that the site could give the CAB information in December to help them with the recommendation.

Bob Meisenheimer explained that he had attended the NRC scoping meeting on November 11. The purpose of the meeting was to obtain stakeholder comment on the proposed scope of the Standard Review Plan that the NRC is developing to guide its reviews of non-high-level waste determinations developed by DOE. Mr. Meisenheimer reviewed a letter that contained his comments. He was proposing that the letter be sent to the NRC before closure of the public comment period, November 25. He indicated that five people spoke at the meeting. It appeared that the review would be risked based and performance based. Some of Mr. Meisenheimer's comments to NRC were that it should contain minimal risk based against the risk if nothing is done; periodic reviews should be held with the regulators and public; contingency plans should be included in case something happens and redundancy should be considered.

Rick McLeod will incorporate the CAB's comments and send the letter back out for distribution and comment. Mr. Meisenheimer emphasized that this letter needed to get to DOE-HQ by November 25.

Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

Perry Holcomb presented the committee's draft motion regarding Public Notification Requirements for Non-Time-Critical Removal Actions (see attachment). He stated the

committee believes the use of non-time-critical removal actions for conducting decommissioning activities effectively integrates regulatory agency oversight responsibility; DOE lead agency responsibility, and state and stakeholder participation. The motion recommends that improved public notification of the Action Memorandum is needed. It asks DOE-SR to file a notice in the site's *Environmental Bulletin* when the Action Memorandum and response to comments for an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for a Non-Time-Critical Removal Action has been placed in the Administrative Record File/Information Repository File (ARF/IRF). It also recommends that DOE-SR do this in a timely fashion and that the bulletin note the location and/or number in the ARF/IRF of the Action Memorandum and response to comments for the EE/CA being placed therein. There was minimal discussion regarding the motion, however the board did modify the motion to ask DOE-SR to file the notice within two weeks of publication in the ARF/IRF.

Public Comments

There were no public comments from members of the general public. Bill Willoughby noted that plutonium consolidation at SRS might be a good topic for a focus group. Bill Lawless asked about the status of the Consolidated Incineration Facility, which is not operating but still under a permit extension.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Tuesday, November 15, 2005, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof
Donna Antonucci
Manuel Bettencourt
Tracey Carroll
Leon Chavous
Arthur Domby
Cassandra Henry
Perry Holcomb
Ranowul Jzar
Bill Lawless

William Lawrence
Wendell Lyon
Jimmy Mackey
Robert Meisenheimer
Joseph Ortaldo
Karen Patterson
Dorene Richardson
Jean Sulc
Carolyn Williams
Gloria Williams Way
Bill Willoughby

Stakeholders

Charlie Hansen

Regulators

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC

Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE
Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC
Albert Frazier, GADNR
Dawn Taylor, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Jeff Allison, DOE
Terry Spears, DOE
Nick Delaplane, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
Randall Ponik, DOE
deLisa Bratcher, DOE
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Joe Carter, WSRC
Sonny Goldston, WSRC
Tiajuana Cochauer, USFS

SRS CAB members Gerald Devitt, Danielle Mackie, and Barbara Paul were unable to attend. Mary Drye was unable to attend on Tuesday. 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 September 27-28, 2005, were approved with no changes.

Agency Update

Bill Spader, DOE, introduced Jeff Allison, DOE-SR Site Manager, who updated the SRS CAB on the acquisition strategy. He committed to open communications regarding the strategy and noted the Secretary has now been briefed regarding the strategy. He commented that DOE will form a source evaluation board. Currently, they are getting resources together and finalizing schedules and acquisition plans. Mr. Allison commented that an integrated project team is working on the process, which includes input from industry and lessons learned from Los Alamos, Hanford, and Idaho. Mr. Allison also discussed Jim Rispoli's visit to SRS on October 20. Mr. Allison also commented on CAB Administration, encouraging the Board to continue to reiterate earlier correspondence. He noted it is recognized the current strategy is the best one,

using the M&O contractor and DOE recognizes that if something is working well, then they don't want to change it.

Bill Spader provided a summary of major accomplishments in 2005. He noted that 257 canisters of vitrified high level waste had been completed; 16,000 drums of transuranic waste removed; D&D of 36 facilities completed and FB-Line was de-inventoried significantly ahead of schedule. Mr. Spader also referred to DOE's response to Recommendation 223 (see attachment). Mr. Spader announced the first two shipments of TRU Waste from Battelle were received at SRS and noted the agreement signed between DOE and SCDHEC on October 11 whereby SRS will accept the Battelle TRU waste. He commented that this is a good story for several sites and the CAB.

Mr. Spader also provided a status update on the Salt Waste Disposal Waste Determination. DOE is awaiting a Technical Evaluation Report from NRC, expected to be completed by November 18. Secretarial approval of the final WD is planned by mid-December 2005. Following Secretarial approval, SCDHEC can initiate review of the permit modifications for the Saltstone Disposal Facility. In the DOE schedule, the permitting process is planned for three to four months and it will include a public comment period. Following approval of the required permits, SRS will require about 30 days to prepare the salt waste for disposal. If these activities proceed on schedule, SRS expects to initiate disposal of salt waste in early May 2006. Mr. Spader said the delay from October 2005 to May 2006 for the start of salt processing can be accommodated without significant impact to SRS waste processing operations.

Mr. Spader announced that the Waste Determination for closure of Tanks 18 and 19 was delivered to NRC on October 3. Public comments are being accepted through November 21, 2005. Mr. Spader elaborated on schedule dates noting that the current projected closure dates are approximately 5 months behind the FFA commitment dates. Mr. Spader also discussed the status of F Canyon. DOE decided to redefine the end states for F Canyon and plans are to maintain the facility in a configuration that is as safe as possible. The main goal remains unchanged, to reduce hazards.

Dawn Taylor, EPA, noted she had been to Hanford to meet with other EPA representatives and tour Hanford. They met with Mark Gilbertson of DOE on improving regulatory interface between DOE and EPA headquarters. They also discussed acquisition strategy. She noted DOE is committed to involving regulators up front to ensure no conflicts with agreements.

Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC, commented that SCDHEC is keeping a close eye on salt and tank closure. She stated that SWPF could be delayed three years. She said SCDHEC is asking questions such as; does the delay in schedule alter other parts of the SP strategy? What are the overall impacts? Does this change the amount of curies left in saltstone? What is the new strategy or new concept? SCDHEC is talking with DOE about the implications of the updated strategy. Regarding the high level waste tanks, SCDHEC is concerned about near term commitments, but also looking at the overall schedule and what the impact is to the overall schedule. This is an aging tank system and the potential

for new leak sites is always there. The schedule is in place for risk reduction, she said. Ms. Sherritt noted discussions with DOE, NRC, DHEC and Governor's Nuclear Advisory Council in October to get a handle on the consultation process to see how it fits in overall context. SCDHEC wants NRC to look at the plans for disposal and provide a quality review. She reiterated that SCDHEC is concerned about salt processing delays as well.

Al Frazier apologized for missing the last meeting, however state travel was limited. He noted the GADNR involvement with SRS facilities is fairly limited. He stated he appreciates the chance to come to meetings and be involved and keep GADNR briefed. He commented that the monitoring program remains unfunded. He also discussed a potential change to the GADNR structure, which has remained unchanged since the early 1970s. GADNR recognized that a change is needed to better serve the public. He noted there could be drastic changes in the way EPD is organized and operated.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Chair Update

Jean Sulc noted attending the groundbreaking ceremony for the MOX plant. CAB officers were invited by the National Nuclear Security Administration. She commented that this bodes well for continued communications. She also noted participation in the Rispoli visit on October 20. She quoted someone in attendance saying Rispoli was a breath of fresh air. She summarized his presentation in three words – Make it Happen. Now is the time to make things happen. All the plans are in place, she relayed. Ms. Sulc noted that Mr. Rispoli seemed very interested in the CABs and public involvement. Ms. Sulc also noted she had heard that David Garman and Ambassador Brooks are working on consolidation of all nuclear materials complex-wide; however this is still two years away.

Facilitator Update

Mike Schoener presented the Recommendation Summary Report (see attached). There are 12 recommendations pending, 30 open and 183 closed. Mr. Schoener also summarized the results of the Recommendation Process Workshop held on Monday.

Waste Management Committee

Joe Ortaldo presented the committee's draft motion regarding the Draft 3116 Determination Document for Closure of Tank 19 and Tank 18 (see attachment). The motion recommended that DOE-SR provide both tank closure modules to SCDHEC no later than October 1, 2006, and provide the SRS CAB by this same date, with information that demonstrates that residual radioactivity in the tank heels meet the applicable performance objectives for tank closure. It also recommended that DOE-SR commit to providing all necessary resources to address NRC's Request for Additional Information by April 1, 2006. It asked DOE-SR to commit to recapturing as much of the closure schedule as possible and strive to meet the existing FFA deadlines for tank closure but in any event commit to finishing

Tank 19 and 18 closures no later than the end of FY07. The motion asked SCDHEC to weigh the reasons why DOE-SR has been unable to meet the FFA deadlines for Tank 19 and Tank 18 closure before taking any enforcement actions. Discussion revolved around clarification of the residuals to be left in the tanks.

Jimmy Mackey moved to accept the motion and Bill Lawless seconded. Bill Lawless stated his support for the motion. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 21 members in favor.

Bob Meisenheimer presented a letter regarding comments to EPA on revised standards at Yucca Mountain (see attachment). The letter formalizes those comments and states the CAB's position regarding the proposed standards. The SRS CAB has reviewed those standards and find them equitable to all interested parties and responsive to the public needs regarding the disposal of HLW in the repository at Yucca Mountain. By a show of hands the board approved transmittal of the subject letter.

Bob Meisenheimer presented a draft letter regarding Salt Waste Processing Facility re-design delays (see attachment). Bill Lawless expressed concerns with removal of a key paragraph the day prior. He was concerned that waiting until January would diminish the opportunity to impact the decision regarding re-design of the SWPF. Karen Patterson noted the Waste Management Committee's continued request for the information regarding SWPF, stating she would like to see the whole picture, rather than pieces. The board reinserted a portion of the paragraph moved the day prior. By a show of hands the board approved transmittal of the subject letter.

Nuclear Materials Committee Report

Karen Patterson noted that the Committee has not been very active. She commented on the DOE-HQ Consolidation Coordination Committee noting they have set themselves up with a schedule of two years. She commented that she has been following the plutonium consolidation issues since 1990, and things are still uncertain. Ms. Patterson also commented on Bush's nominee to head the Office of Civilian and Radioactive Waste Management is a utility industry executive with Excelon who is used to getting things done. Ms. Patterson also noted that Congress has slashed funding for Yucca Mountain citing schedule delays. Funding had included 50 million to spur recycling, more benign and more tolerant of nuclear non proliferation. There is no money for interim storage of spent nuclear fuel.

Administrative Committee Report

Perry Holcomb called a point of procedural order. He asked if there was to be no debate today, but debate in January. If there are motions made in January which change these, are those motions voted on then? Or if there is a change in the bylaws, does that have to go out in a separate mailing? Mike Schoener explained that there will be a motion made to accept that will open discussion. If a motion to change is made, then a motion to amend must be made and then that motion will be voted prior to the original motion on the table. The only thing that can be amended to change is the proposed wording. Perry

Holcomb moved that all discussions regarding bylaws changes be moved to January. There was no second.

Meryl Alalof presented the following proposal to amend the bylaws:

Section 3.2 Terms of Appointment

The terms of office for Members of the Board shall consist of 25 two-year terms with new appointments made annually on a staggered schedule as the Members' terms of office expire. Terms of office for ~~new~~ Members shall be two years. A Member shall serve no more than three consecutive terms of office. ~~To serve consecutive terms of office,~~ Current Board members will be subject to all selection criterion and re-elected by the full Board as set forth in Section 3.3. After a lapse of two or more years, a Board Member may be re-elected. *At any given time, there shall be no more than four returning members who have previously served six years on the Board.*

Section 4.1 Number

The officers of the Board shall be chairperson and vice chairperson. ~~In the event that the office of chair is held by co-chairpersons, the office of vice-chair may or may not be filled.~~ The Board may create, from time to time, other positions of office as it deems necessary.

Section 4.2 Duties

a) Chairperson(~~s~~): The Chairperson(~~s~~) or Vice Chairperson shall preside over all meetings and shall have primary responsibility for the Board's relations with the Agencies. The Chair shall be the official public spokesperson(~~s~~) for the Board with regard to issues and policy recommendations previously addressed by the Board and authorized by a majority vote unless the Board Members delegate the responsibility to another Officer or Member. The Chairperson(~~s~~) or Vice Chairperson may serve as a Member of a committee of the Board but shall not chair an issues-based committee.

Section 5.2 Committee Chairpersons

....The chairperson of each committee shall name a vice chair ~~or co-chair~~, who shall have full authority to act for the Chair/~~Co-Chair~~ in his/her absence or incapacity.

Section 5.4 Ex-Officio Committee Members

The Chairperson ~~or Co-chairperson~~ and Vice Chair of the Board shall serve as ex-officio, non-voting Members of all committees on which they do not serve as a regular Member.

Section 5.6 Committees

b)Notice of an intention to run for election shall be made orally or in writing to the Chairperson of this committee and must be received no later than ~~72 hours~~ **by noon three working days** prior to a meeting at which the election is to be held.

Section 6.4 Agenda

The Chairperson(~~s~~) of the Board shall set the agenda for Board meetings.

Section 7.4 Individuals Ineligible for Board Membership

a) Management employees of the Agencies *and* DOE contractors at SRS, ~~and environmental restoration and waste management employees at SRS~~, as well as immediate family members (spouses, children, parents, and anyone living in the same household as the individual who falls into one of the excluded groups); are not eligible for Board membership.

b) In general, *current* employees of *the Agencies and* DOE contractors at SRS are not eligible for membership on the Board. However, an employee of *an Agency DOE* contractor may qualify for Board membership if such employee successfully shows that his presence on the Board would not result in a conflict of interest. In any event there shall be no more than *two* membership positions on the Board held by employees of DOE contractors at SRS.

Perry Holcomb presented the second proposal to amend the bylaws. He stated that on October 19, he prepared the letter offering the change to the bylaws following attendance at an Administrative Committee meeting. He said that two words have not been mentioned that were discussed during that meeting- power cliques. He said that his proposal is offered in the same light as the change proposed in Section 3.2. Mr. Holcomb stated that if old members can form a powerbase of cliques, then certainly regulators could later become members of the board and form power cliques. Mr. Holcomb commented this board needs diversity and the bylaws provide for diversity. He commented that the CAB has elections every year and elects new people every year. Mr. Holcomb stated that there has not been an election that has not elected at least one new member. He stated that his own submittal is “stupid” and he takes all the credit for it, but at least he thinks he has made a point. Mr. Holcomb presented the following proposal to amend the bylaws:

Section 7.4 Individuals Ineligible for Board Membership

c. There shall be no more than two membership positions on the Board held by former employees of the US Department of Energy (DOE), the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the SC Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) combined.

Public Comment

No public comments were made.

Administrative Committee Report continued

Following a break for lunch, Mike Schoener asked for comments regarding the bylaws amendment proposal from each of the CAB members. The following comments were provided:

- Gloria Williams Way valued former members, but suggested emeritus status for former members.
- Joe Ortaldo stated he shared Gloria's point of view that there is a tremendous knowledge base. He noted the proposal was to put a reasonable number on returning members. However it turns out, Mr. Ortaldo stated the CAB should consider emeritus status to take advantage of former member's interest and knowledge. He agreed with limiting SRS employees to 2 and suggested if the CAB limited the agencies, then the limit be applied to active agency employees.
- William Lawrence noted that when bylaws were first written they were that way for a reason. The terms are staggered in order to reach more folks. He stated everything needs limits and he agreed everyone should have a chance to learn about operations if they want to. He stated he agreed with the Administrative Committee.
- Tracy Carroll stated she is opposed to both of the amendments. She stated the CAB does have an election process and the CAB should just not elect returning member if they want to limit them. She suggested that the CAB application note if a candidate works for any agencies or have served on the CAB before. She commented that the CAB members can vote for or against the candidate.
- Meryl Alalof commented that the number proposed to limit the returning members is an average from the retreat. She commented the proposal to amend is not directed to any individuals and no personalities are involved. She commented that people get expertise from serving and as many people as possible should get that chance. She speaks in favor of the Administrative Committee proposal, but not Perry's.
- Manuel Bettencourt noted that the decision for this amendment was based on the need for diversity and giving more people chance to serve.
- Bill Willoughby spoke in opposition to limiting returning board members. He said you lose too much continuity and understanding. He stated that if the CAB feels there are too many alumni, then do not vote them back, but don't put a restriction that would prohibit someone you'd like to elect.
- Bob Meisenheiner commented he is ambivalent about returning members. He commented the CAB may want to impose a limit in elections.
- Cassandra Henry noted she is a proponent of continuity. She said it is important that the expertise of those who have served not go by the wayside. The way the election is set as far as diversity is fine, but don't limit it.
- Art Domby commented he sees both sides, desires to obtain long term the expertise developed by CAB members; and on the other hand he clearly recognizes the desire to broaden the base of activities. He wondered if there

might be a way to figure out how to obtain expertise and self police without an amendment to the bylaws. He stated he is still sorting it out.

- Karen Patterson commented she is opposed to this amendment. She said she hates to put limits. She would prefer to evaluate people up for election and self police. She suggested that the gap between getting off the board and getting back on needs to be broadened.
- Carolyn Williams commented that she sees both sides. The expertise is invaluable, however, it is a citizens board and we need more people in the community to see what's going on. She stated that she basically feels that the CAB has elections on an individual basis and if a candidate can provide a service, then they should be allowed to be considered.
- Leon Chavous stated he is straddling the fence. He said it's good to come around and sometimes it's not. By putting a limit, you may put a good product at a disadvantage. He said to let your conscious be your guide when deciding for or against. Mr. Chavous stated that your reputation is what men think you are and character is what God knows you to be.
- Perry Holcomb stated it was good to hear each individual person's viewpoint. He commented that each of the members brings something different in their background, likes, and dislikes. He said the CAB lets people know and is not afraid to speak out. He commented that the Board tries to accomplish the good things at SRS. He commented that he is against the Administrative Committee motion and against his own as well. He presented a chart noting how other Site Specific Advisory Boards view returning members. Mr. Holcomb stated that Savannah River is already the most restrictive of how long you have to wait to come back. He stated he will not ask members to support his side and will not politic this bylaw change. He commented he appreciated Board member's comments whether for or against.
- Jimmy Mackey commented he was not going to repeat what's already been said, but noted Mr. Holcomb's slide is enlightening. He stated he can't see the CAB having to fiddle with these particular amendments. He stated there is no reason and it was a quirk of fate that there are three returning members here now.
- Wendell Lyon stated he was sympathetic to the people and going with a number to limit is a good place to start. He said it's not like its put in stone and can be changed. Mr. Lyon stated he really didn't care what the other CABs are doing.
- Donna Antonucci commented that looking at Perry's slide, perhaps the SRS CAB is more restrictive because perhaps there is a problem. She compared it to a shrimp fisherman casting a broad net. She commented that perhaps the CABs are not allowing some people who are just as qualified. She spoke in favor of first proposal and stated she is not in favor of second because she does not see a need for it.
- Bill Lawless noted that it looks like the motions will not pass, but the administrative changes should be made. He stated that regarding returnees, he has mixed feelings as well. It is good to get as many people on the board as possible, but be aware of the purpose of the board, he said, which is to help clean up SRS as fast as possible and, as safely as possible. He commented that returnees are a valuable resource. One of the problems, new members have is standing up to the

agencies. He said it is easy for DOE to run arguments to a young board, so he would have to think long and hard before voting.

- Jean Sulc supports holding returning members to four. She brought out a single chair noting this is a special place. Where else can a person obtain a solid base for nuclear waste issues; great support from a public involvement team; and be acknowledged as one of the best boards. She said she cannot in good conscience deny this spot to someone. She said it is not the Board's mission but should be their duty to fill the space with as many people as possible in the communities.

Meryl Alalof presented the FY05 final budget (see attachment). Board expenditures for FY05 totaled \$224, 318.

Ms. Alalof also presented candidates for membership in 2006. The following was presented:

Position 1

Clara Chance, Augusta, Ga.
Cynthia Gilliard, Aiken, S.C.
Sarah Watson, Irmo, S.C.

Position 2

Dorothy Barnard, Evans, Ga.
Donnie Beer, Beaufort, S.C.
Karen Patterson, Aiken, S.C. (I)

Position 3

Barbara Paul, Pelion, S.C.(I)
(I)
Lynn Thompson, Evans, Ga.

Position 4

Gloria Williams-Way, Augusta, Ga.

Barbara Zmijewski, Augusta, Ga.

Position 5

Howard Cahill, Beaufort, S.C.
Charles Foster, Trenton, S.C.
Robert Meisenheimer, Hilton Head, S.C. (I).

Position 6

Terri Chaput, Savannah, Ga.
Madeleine Marshall, Aiken, S.C.

Position 7

Elaine Boyington, Savannah, Ga.
Cheryl David, Savannah, Ga.
Mercredi Giles, Savannah, Ga.
S.C.

Position 8

Eleanor Galin, Savannah, Ga.
Judith Greene-McLeod, Jackson, S.C.
Kathleen Sobel, Bluffton,

Position 9

Undrey Bostic, Augusta, Ga.
Charles Utley, Augusta, Ga.
Alex Williams, Aiken, S.C.

Position 10

Kuppuswam Jayaraman, Savannah, Ga.
Christopher Timmers, Columbia, S.C.
John Winarchick, Hilton Head, S.C.

Position 11

Robert Beliles, Hilton Head, S.C.
David Dawson, Savannah, Ga.
Dell Isham, Columbia, S.C.

Position 12

Dalton Brannen, Augusta, Ga.
Matt Bronson, Martinez, Ga.
Wade Waters, Savannah, Ga.

Meryl Alalof conducted 2006-07 officer elections. Karen Patterson will serve as Chair of the Board and Donna Antonucci will serve as Vice Chair. They will take office following the January Board meeting.

Public Comments

There were no comments from the general public. Jimmy Mackey commented that free internet training on environmental issues may be available and he would let the board know how to access the training. Bill Lawless announced an upcoming event sponsored by the Aiken Women's Heart Board in Aiken, S.C. and Donna Antonucci thanked the Board for its support, noting high bars had been set by her predecessors and she hoped to live up to their expectations.

Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

Drew Grainger provided a presentation on the Environmental Assessment: Safeguards and Security Upgrades for Storage of Plutonium Materials (see attachment). DOE has issued a draft environmental assessment to address the impacts of proposed safeguards and security upgrades for plutonium materials stored at SRS. Comments on the draft EA will be accepted until December 7, 2005. DOE will incorporate responses to comments made at this meeting into the final EA. By mid-December 2005 DOE will either begin preparation of an environmental impact statement or issue a finding of no significant impact. Safeguards and security upgrades are proposed to augment the capability to respond to the enhanced terrorist threat that has existed since the attacks on September 11, 2001. In the EA, DOE evaluates several proposed activities, all of which respond to the enhanced terrorist threat. Mr. Grainger discussed the proposed activities to deinventory the F Area storage facility; construction and operation of container surveillance (CSSC) and storage capability in K Area; construction and operation of interim surveillance capability in K Area while CSSC is completed; security upgrades in K Area; and modification and expansion of the Advanced Tactical Training Area. He discussed the scope of each of these proposed activities and the impacts to construction and operations. Mr. Grainger summarized noting that DOE proposes to take action to provide safeguards and security for plutonium materials currently stored at SRS. One facility would be used for storage of SRS plutonium and the same building would house surveillance and stabilization equipment to ensure compliance with DOE Standard 3013. Security upgrades would be provided for the single storage facility and the ATTA range would be expanded to ensure that protective force personnel can be trained to respond to the enhanced terrorist threat.

Discussion revolved around scenarios in which a canister might be compromised, emergency preparedness, impacts to wetlands and endangered species, if K Area can handle all the plutonium in the country; and whether other nuclear materials are being considered.

Perry Holcomb presented a draft motion regarding Public Notification Requirements for Non-Time Critical Removal Actions (see attachment). Because of the need for improved public notifications of an Action Memorandum, the motion recommended that DOE-SR file a notice in the site's *Environmental Bulletin* when the Action Memorandum and

response to comments for an EE/CA for a Non-Time Critical Removal Action has been placed in the Administrative Record File/Information Repository File. The motion asked that DOE-SR do this within two weeks following its publication of the ARF/IRF and also note the location and or number in the ARF/IRF of the Action Memorandum and response to comments for the EE/CA being placed therein. Jimmy Mackey moved the Board adopt the motion and Meryl Alalof seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 20 members in favor.

Strategic & Legacy Management Committee

William Lawrence noted the Annual Report for Historic Preservation was just released (see attachment). He also announced there would be a committee meeting in January.

Handouts

November 14-15, 2005 CAB Agenda

Draft letter to EPA Docket Center, dated November 16, 2005

Draft letter to Jeff Allison, dated November 15, 2005, Salt Waste Processing Facility

Redesign Delays

Potential Impacts to Proposed National Policy on Buried Alpha Waste at SRS, Third Draft, M. Bettencourt, CAB

Draft 3116 Determination for Closure of Tank 19 and Tank 18, First Draft, Joe Ortaldo, CAB

Public Notification Requirements for Non-Time-Critical Removal Actions, Second Draft, Perry Holcomb, CAB

SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

SRS Gold Metrics

Draft letter to EPA Docket Center, dated November 16, 2005

Draft letter to Jeff Allison, dated November 15, 2005, Salt Waste Processing Facility

Redesign Delays

SRS CAB Comments to Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Bob Meisenheimer, CAB

Draft 3116 Determination for Closure of Tank 19 and Tank 18, Final Draft, Joe Ortaldo, CAB

Proposal to Amend the Bylaws, Meryl Alalof, CAB

SRS CAB Fiscal Year 2005 Final Budget Summary

Environmental Assessment: Safeguards and Security Upgrades for Storage of Plutonium Materials, Drew Grainger, DOE

Public Notification Requirements for Non-Time-Critical Removal Actions, Final Draft, Perry Holcomb, CAB

Letter to Jean Sulc from EPA, dated November 9, 2005, Recommendation #222

Letter to Jean Sulc from SCDHEC, dated November 7, 2005, Recommendation 221 and 222

Letter to Jean Sulc from DOE, dated November 14, 2005, Recommendation 223

Letter to Jean Sulc from DOE, dated November 4, 2005, Recommendation 219

NEPA Report

Submittal of SRS Cold War Built Environment Historic Preservation Annual Summary Report for FY05