



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

### **Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee**

**North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, SC**

**4/26/05**

The SRS Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee (FD&SR) met on Tuesday, April 26, 5:00 PM, at the North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, SC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and receive updates on the SRS F-Canyon Decommissioning and the SRS Community Involvement Plan.

Attendance was as follows:

#### **CAB Members**

- Perry Holcomb
- Leon Chavous
- Mary Drye
- Karen Patterson
- Joe Ortaldo
- Jean Sulc
- Bill Lawless

#### **Stakeholders**

- Dennis Baker
- Mike French
- Lee Poe
- Cy Bannick

#### **DOE/Contractors**

- Dave Freeman, WSRC
- De'Lisa Bratcher, DOE
- Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
- John Cook, WSRC
- Larry Pike, WSRC
- Ed McNamee, BSRI
- Helen Belencan, DOE
- Brian Hennessey, DOE
- Gerald Blount, WSRC
- R.S. Starkey, CH2M

#### **Regulators**

- Robert Pope, EPA
- Ted Millings,
- SCDHEC

#### **\*CAB Technical**

- Advisor
- FD&SR committee
- members
- +Facilitator
- ^Press

Perry Holcomb, Chair, opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. In addition, he asked to go around the room for introductions by all.

**FD&SR Committee meeting schedule review:** Paul Sauerborn presented the schedule, which listed focus areas that the FD&SR committee will be reviewing for 2005. Mr. Sauerborn stated that should anyone in the public have an item relevant to the ER committee scope to please notify him in order that he have those items reviewed and approved by the chairman of the

FD&SR committee for future presentations. Bill Lawless asked how the request should be delivered. Mr. Sauerborn stated that the request could be made verbally, in writing, or e-mail.

**SRS Community Relations Plan Update and Status:** Brian Hennessey stated the purpose of this presentation is to present the DRAFT SRS Community Involvement Plan status and to solicit CAB and other stakeholder input. Mr. Hennessey indicated that CAB recommendation 203 asked that the FFA implementation plan incorporate revisions to the public participation process based on SRS CAB and stakeholder input. The DOE agreed to revise the SRS Community Relations Plan. EPA SCDHEC and DOE decided the revision should also describe D&D public involvement activities.

Stakeholder input received and addressed was to:

- Include public participation for D&D
- Add RCRA and CERCLA public participation regulatory requirements
- Clarify the CAB's role for public involvement
- Revise "roadmap" and text
- Evaluate whether SRS provides enough opportunities for public involvement

As a result the new Community Involvement template from the Superfund Community Involvement Toolkit was followed. Web sites were listed for agencies and many resources, 2000 census data was used, and the CAB's role was highlighted, additional SRS public participation efforts noted and D&D public involvement activities added.

Mr. Hennessey stated that the path forward was to complete the incorporation of stakeholder comments and distribute the CIP at the first CAB meeting following regulatory approval of the document.

Lee Poe asked if the document would be more prescriptive or remain general as it is now. Mr. Hennessey stated that it would remain as it is now.

**F-Canyon Decommissioning Update:** Helen Belencan identified several dates that the CAB has been briefed on various D&D activities, but stated that the purpose of this briefing was to discuss the approach and plans for F-Canyon Decommissioning and receive input from the CAB. Ms. Belencan stated the following facts for F-Canyon and the B-Line:

F-Canyon

- Built in the early 1950's
- Processing began in November 1954
- Chemically separates and decontaminates Pu-239
- 835 ft. in length, 122 ft. in width and 52 ft. high
- Four levels, Two canyons- warm and hot
- Approximately 175,000 sq. ft.

B-Line

- Original "B Line" housed in Levels 3 and 4 of F-Canyon
- F area upgrades 1957-1959, with "New" B Line constructed on Levels 5 and 6
- Operated to support defense needs 1959-1990 with the facility placed in standby at end of Cold War
- Restarted in 1995 to stabilize legacy nuclear materials
- Approximately 68,000 sq. ft.

Ms. Belencan stated that SRS looked at the Hanford sites five canyon buildings, which conducted their evaluation according to the CERCLA remedial action process (Feasibility Study issued in 2001, Final Proposed Plan issued in 2004 and Record of Decision issued in 2005. The alternatives that were looked at were:

Alternative 0: No Action

Alternative 1: Full Removal and Disposal

Alternative 2: Decontaminate and leave in place (considered not protective and so not further evaluated)

Alternative 3: Entombment with internal waste disposal

Alternative 4: Entombment with internal/external waste disposal

Alternative 5: Close in place – standing structure (considered not viable and so not further evaluated)

Alternative 6: Close in place – collapsed structure

Ms. Belencan stated that in addition to the alternatives above, that the DOE Office of Inspector General provided a report that concluded:

- Preliminary studies suggest that the Hanford canyons could be used to dispose of mixed and low-level waste
- IG concluded that the DOE did not adequately consider using 221-U canyon as a waste disposal site, and the economic benefits were not thoroughly investigated

Therefore the IG recommended that:

- Hanford was to perform a cost study considering all waste types as viable candidates for disposal in a canyon
- Savannah River and Idaho consider the viability of disposing of waste in canyons and similar facilities, based on the results of the Hanford study

Ms. Belencan turned the meetings attention back to the SRS F-Canyon deactivation path forward, discussing the F-Canyon deactivation end point review, and environmental characterization. The F-Canyon deactivation plan was based on an indefinite delay between deactivation and decommissioning, and in November 2004, site D&D, with support from SGCP and FCC, evaluated deactivation end points relative to a change in decommissioning timing from “indefinite” to “near term” ranging from 0 to 15 years. The evaluation focused on safety (power, criticality, environmental conditions, fire protection, and building envelope) and efficiency (cranes, elevators, and environment).

Upon review of the evaluation, minor changes were identified in four areas:

- Environmental conditions – S&M program was modified to include monitoring for indications of mold growth
- Building envelope – modified means of sealing railroad access doors
- Cranes – modified to block the trucks and so reduce damage
- Elevators – lay up plan modified

In addition, radiological surveys inside the hot and warm canyon will identify hot spots for decommissioning follow-up, if necessary.

Gerald Blount gave status of Groundwater activities, stating that there are two CERCLA groundwater Operable Units (OU) that cover F and H area (General Separations Area (GSA) eastern covers H area), and (GSA western covers F area) where characterization is underway. Mr. Blount pointed out that the Groundwater OU's recognize that final actions to the groundwater would be most effective after the closing of the areas and were created to continue monitoring the groundwater contamination for plumes that could impact the surface waters, noting that if plumes are identified that could significantly impact the surface water, then some remedial actions would be considered. Mr. Blount stated that most of the characterization in the area has been toward groundwater (mostly solvents and tritium, with very low activity of iodine-129, strontium-90, and nitrates are present in the groundwater). The groundwater contamination suggests that there may be some limited soil contamination near the facility around sumps and pipeline junctions which are somewhat prone to leakage. In conclusion, Mr. Blount stated the future plans call for complete groundwater characterization of GSA western groundwater OU, continue monitoring until F-area is closed, and to use process knowledge and the ultimate closure plan to determine what additional characterization is needed.

Ms. Belencan summarized by stating that DOE-SR is organizing and preparing for the F-area planning phase. The approach to decommissioning F-canyon will follow the framework established by:

- Joint EPA and DOE memorandum of May 1995, which establishes the approach agreed upon by the EPA and the DOE for decommissioning surplus DOE facilities consistent with the requirements of the CERCLA removal action process while retaining sufficient flexibility to tailor activities to meet specific site needs and achieve risk reduction and environmental restoration expeditiously
- DOE G 430.1-4, "Decommissioning Implementation Guide"
- Procedure manual 1C – Facility Disposition Manual
- Formal process with involvement of EPA, SCDHEC, memorandum of agreement for achieving an accelerated cleanup vision at the Savannah River Site, May 22, 2003

Ms. Belencan mentioned relative to decommissioning planning that preliminary planning will begin this year with the development of an initial documentation, with decommissioning occurring between 2009 and 2015.

Joe Ortaldo stated that to just give the cost of different alternatives for F-canyon is not a fair assessment, in that there are many offsetting advantages associated with the alternatives. Lee Poe asked what types of analysis has been conducted. Brian Hennessey stated that model fate and transport studies have been conducted. Mr. Poe wanted to know if the truck well into the warm canyon would be sealed. Ms. Belencan stated that she thought it would be. Mr. Poe wanted to know if contamination is in the hot canyon air tunnel and if so what would be the plans to address the issue. Ms. Belencan stated that she was uncertain of the specifics regarding specifics and would investigate. Mr. Poe asked if there was documentation on the wells near 221-F. Mr. Blount stated that he would produce a report for Mr. Poe regarding his inquiry. Robert Pope stated that he would personally like to see more than an EE/CA for F-canyon, and it should follow a more remedial approach. Mr. Poe stated that he was not satisfied with the proposed EE/CA process and would also see a more stringent analysis performed on such a large project as F-canyon. Mr. Poe pointed out that calculations on concrete degradation over time

should be performed before going too far in the direction of possibly using F-canyon as a repository for other waste.

**Public Comments:** Mr. Poe stated that he believes a special public workshop should be considered for F-Canyon Decommissioning. Perry Holcomb thanked all in attendance that participated in the meeting.

Mr. Holcomb adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

*Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.*