

**Savannah River Site
Citizens Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
March 23 - 24, 2009
Aiken, SC**

Monday, March 23, 2009, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Emile Bernard
Manuel Bettencourt
Donald Bridges
Edward Burke
Ric Castagna
Arthur Domby
Mercredi Giles
Kathe Golden
Judith Greene-McLeod
Lee Harley-Fitts
Rose Hayes
Stanley Howard
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman
Ranowul Jzar
Cleveland Latimore
Madeleine Marshall
Joseph Ortaldo
Marolyn Parson
Elizabeth Skyye Vereen
Gerald Wadley
Sarah Watson
Alex Williams

Agency Liaisons

Al Frazier, GADNR
Patrick McGuire, DOE-SR
Robert Pope, EPA
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC

DOE/Other

Helen Belencen, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Karen Guevara, DOE
Doug Hintze, DOE
Lance Schlag, DOE
Sharon Smith, DOE
Terry Spears, DOE
Tiajuana Cochnauer, USFS

Stakeholders

Joan Mobley
Karen Patterson
James Sturkie

Regulators

Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Van Keisler, SCDHEC
Tom Rolka, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC
Eric Owens, SCDHEC

Contractors

Chris Bergen, SRNS
Anna Cornelious, Techlaw
Sonny Goldston, SRNS
Paul Sauerborn, SRNS
Steve Thomas, SRNS
Nancye Bethurem, WSRC
Jenny Freeman, V3
Bill Lawless, V3
Mindy Mets, V3
Eddie Watson, V3
Debbie Wisham, V3
Elmer Wilhite, SRNL

The Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Facilitator, Jenny Freeman opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda. She invited public participation and asked those wishing to make a Public Comment to sign up on a sheet located on the CAB documentation table at the meeting room entrance. She said there are designated times during the afternoon for public comment and during the Combined Committee meeting the public may participate at any time by stepping up to the microphone.

Ms. Freeman stated that the meeting is the first for our newly elected members; she asked that the meeting start with everyone around the table introducing themselves. The members were asked to sign up for the committee they will work on during the year. CAB members not in attendance were Beverly Skinner and John Snedeker.

**Strategic and Legacy Management (S&LM) Committee, Madeleine Marshall – Co-Chair
Judith Greene-McLeod – Co-Chair**

Ms. Marshall described the S&LM committee for the members and the work they have been developing and work plan topics they will be working on. She encouraged members to join her committee.

Ms. Marshall stated that the committee had 6 open recommendations during the past year. She elaborated that a recommendation the committee submitted on site tours was accepted by DOE and initiated during the past month with a great interest by the public. She said the recommendation would be closed. She announced that during the scheduled committee meeting in early May the group would work on closing additional recommendations.

She said the members received a copy of the site strategic plan to review and provide input. She said a letter was sent to DOE incorporating the members' input on the plan. In addition, she stated, the group would hear a presentation on the strategic plan that day.

Mr. Bettencourt informed the group that during the SSAB meeting he attended last week he became aware that many sites have conducted public involvement or community involvement workshops. He asked that the members

consider starting with the volunteer organizations in the area and work towards evolving a community involvement workshop in this area. He asked Mr. McGuire if it would be possible. Mr. McGuire stated that he was aware of the program at other sites and he thought it would be good for the CAB to step up and take a leadership role in that area. Mr. Bettencourt asked that the S&LM committee take on the topic which is that committee's area of focus.

Presentation - Integrated Priority List and Budget Update - Lance Schlag, Director, Mission Planning Division, DOE-SR

Mr. Schlag briefed the members with an update to the SRS budget and integrated priority list. His summary included the EM planned budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 and a FY 2010 budget process update. He also spoke about the Integrated Priority List for FY 2011.

Mr. Schlag outlined the DOE budget flow process explaining that DOE Headquarters (HQ) Issues Budget development guidance during the February through April timeframe, which is issued to the Contractors to develop a Budget and then goes to Federal Project Director for review. From April through September, the HQ CFO reviews and consolidates and then moves on to the HQ program offices for review before returning to DOE-SR for review and consolidation. He stated that during September through January the budget is reviewed by the Secretary of Energy and forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) that submits the budget to the President. He stated that all budget information is embargoed until after the President submits his budget request to Congress in February.

He summarized the EM Budget appropriations for FY07, FY08, and FY09. In addition, he shared the NNSA budget summary.

He referred to the SRS EM work scope Project Baseline Summary (PBS) listing and explained how it correlates to the integrated priority list. Mr. Schlag stated that he would send the group a detailed list of the PBS budget breakdown.

Mr. Schlag displayed the FY 2011 EM Integrated Priority List and explained how it correlates to the budget initiatives. He stated that they want input from the CAB on the integrated priority list topics

Mr. McGuire stated that the priority of the items on the list is how the funding is distributed and that the CAB input on what the public prioritizes is important.

Madeleine Marshall said the CAB would like to see information that describes the impact of changes to the budget after it is submitted. She explained that if cuts are made to the Site budget a description of what will be cut should be communicated as it relates to the priority list items.

Mr. McGuire stated that Mr. Schlag could add columns on the FY09 EM budget summary table for budget amount requested, continuing resolution amount, and possibly add the impact of any increase or decrease descriptions in that area also. Mr. Schlag agreed that could be done fairly quickly.

Mr. Bettencourt stated that it would be helpful to see what the FY09 integrated priority list figures were and the comparison figures with the current funding.

Mr. Schlag replied that historically the funding is exhausted around the area completion point on the integrated priority list.

Due to recording difficulties this area of the meeting may be incomplete.

Nuclear Materials Committee, Donald Bridges – Chair
Stan Howard – Vice Chair
Ed Burke – Vice Chair

Mr. Bridges stated the Nuclear Materials Committee presently had 4 open recommendations with the most recent recommendation being Recommendation 259 issued in November 2008. He said at least 2 of the open recommendations could be closed with receipt of the most recent correspondence regarding Recommendation 259. He said the nuclear materials storage at SRS is a bit clouded to him. He stated that the Plutonium (Pu) continues to be consolidated at SRS from thru out the DOE complex. The most recent DOE plans has most of the Pu being constructively used as fuel in nuclear power plants with the fuel to be fabricated at SRS in the NNSA MOX Facility.

Mr. Bridges said the remaining Pu was scheduled to be processed in the SRS liquid waste system with the Pu ultimately ending up in DWPF glass canisters and recently there has been a question raised about the quantity of Pu permitted to be placed in the DWPF canisters. Also, he said, there seems to be a question raised about the contract between the nuclear utilities and DOE regarding the MOX Fuel, further, there seems to be still another question being raised on the ultimate storage facility at Yucca Mountain that DOE had planned on as final storage for the DWPF canisters. He raised the question is that final storage facility viable? He stated that these questions have caused DOE to fundamentally reassess their approach for Pu Disposition. He said they are rethinking the matter and have committed to report to the CAB in the May-June Timeframe. He said that for the time being all Pu Disposition questions are on hold pending the DOE look. He finished by saying that the next Nuclear Materials Committee meeting planned for April 28th.

Waste Management Committee, Joe Ortaldo – Chair

Art Domby – Vice Chair (Liquid Waste)

Alex Williams – Vice Chair (Solid Waste)

Mr. Ortaldo welcomed new members and described the objectives of the Waste Management committee. He said the goal of the committee is closing the high level liquid waste tanks, solid waste cleanup which is the Transuranic (TRU) waste on site, and salt waste processing. He defined the areas in detail for the new members.

He informed the group that the committee met on March 10th and heard a presentation from Sherri Ross who will give the presentation to the full board on the following day. He said the presentation addressed the committee's Recommendations 224, 162, 135. He said Tom Cantey, NNSA, attended the meeting and updated the group on the progress of the MOX waste solidification building. He stated that the update addressed the committees' recommendation 255 which suggested that the DOE and NNSA utilizing existing EM facilities to save in the cost of the facility. Mr. Ortaldo told the group that committee meeting presentations are generally to address progress of a recommendation in addition to presenting requested information. He said that Sonni Blanco also presented the critical path schedule update on the Salt Waste Processing Facility at the March 10th meeting.

Mr. Ortaldo announced that Recommendations 231 and 245 would be closed based on the presentation given to the committee on January 13, 2009. At last committee meeting he asked members to forward their comments about Recommendation 255 to him and if none are received the recommendation would be closed.

He stated that on March 12th he attended the Governor's Nuclear Advisory Council where there was a tremendous amount of discussion on the Yucca Mountain issue and the future of a repository.

Mr. Ortaldo turned the floor over to Art Domby to discuss a letter sent to DOE in reference to the F Tank Farm Performance Assessment.

Mr. Domby enlightens the group on the radioactive content on the site in comparison to F Tank Farm and EM in general. He also described the different contamination paths derived from F Tank Farm. He summarized the letter that addressed the performance assessment. He said the first area the letter addressed was the point of compliance of the different agencies and asked that the agencies involved DOE, NRC, and SCDHEC reconcile their regulatory constrictions. He said the second comment in the letter stated from a laymens review, it appeared that DOE used conservative assumptions, meaning it was more protective to public health and safety by institutional controls of the area. Finally, he said the maximum exposed individual would be 1.4 millirem that is relatively small.

Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC, stated that her organization is very involved in the Tank closures at the site. She said the HLW Tanks are regulated by SCDHEC in several program areas and that for a tank to close DOE has to propose a closure plan which is reviewed by DHEC and will submit for public comment. She said the law, Section 3116 of 2005 MDAA, requires that the waste left in the tanks has to fall under an approved closure plan by the regulatory agency. She said DHEC was fully involved in the performance assessment. Ms. Wilson said a statement in the letter seemed to implicate DHEC as causing a delay. She said earlier she spoke to Joe Ortaldo and asked he clarify what they spoke about.

Mr. Ortaldo stated he did not intend to imply that DHEC was the agency delaying the closures. He said that to the best of his knowledge DHEC has never been a delay to tank closure.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation Committee, K. Jayaraman - Chair

New Committee Chair, Kuppuswami Jayaraman, stated that he has reviewed the past work of the committee and can see there is important upcoming work for the committee; he asked new members to consider joining.

Draft Recommendation Motion – A/M Groundwater Plume Program Update to the Public

Don Bridges reviewed the specifics of the draft Recommendation for the members and invited comments. He stated that due to personal circumstances the members did not receive the change he presented in their earlier mailing. The group discussed the draft recommendation as presented and based on group suggestions, it was decided the committee would re-work the document and present it to the full board the next day.

Administrative Committee, Sarah Watson – Chair

Committee Chair, Sarah Watson, welcomed the new members at their first full board meeting. She said they should consider joining the committee that gains their interest. She stated that Stanley Howard has agreed to oversee the mentoring program for new members and he will give more information the next day. She told the group that the Internet based committee meeting work is progressing and they will receive information in the next few weeks. She informed the group that student participation is continuing to be researched by the committee members. She announced that the new member selection campaign will be accelerated for the upcoming campaign due to HQ requirements and at the next board meeting she will have detailed information.

Letter for discussion

Mr. Bettencourt presented a letter for the board to discuss from the CAB to DOE regarding the Yucca Mountain repository. He summarized the contents of the letter and said the Waste Management committee will prepare an associated recommendation to soon follow the letter. He asked that members review the letter and they vote to discuss the letter further the next day.

Public Comments

Tom Clements, Friend of the Earth, Columbia, SC introduced himself and described his organization. He welcomed the new members and asked that they reflect on the importance of their positions and realize that the DOE is a closed agency. He said that the information they receive from DOE and the questions they ask are some of the small window into the agency. He encouraged the members to ask questions and don't take everything DOE says as the truth and don't think they have given you all the information. He gave an example he experienced at the Governors Nuclear Council meeting in which the department had the opportunity to say the MOX program had run into trouble, they said nothing and chose not to inform the public so he informed the public.

He stated that he attended the SSAB meeting in Augusta the previous week. He informed the group that one of the presenters who is a Deputy Assistant Secretary and another who is an acting Assistant Secretary for DOE actually encouraged people to pursue the Energy Park concept as future use of the site as either a spent fuel facility or reprocessing facility. He said he feels they have gone to far in encouraging people to make this a reprocessing facility.

Kathy Golden stated that she was able to attend the SSAB meeting on one day last week, as well. She said several other SSAB's commented that they have problems with DOE at their sites. She stated her gratitude to the SRS DOE and their willingness to provide the board with information and presentations.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Tuesday, March 24, 2009, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Emile Bernard
Manuel Bettencourt
Donald Bridges
Edward Burke
Ric Castagna
Arthur Domby
Mercredi Giles
Kathe Golden
Judith Greene-McLeod
Lee Harley-Fitts
Rose Hayes
Stanley Howard
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman
Ranowul Jzar
Cleveland Latimore
Denise Long
Madeleine Marshall
Joseph Ortaldo
Marolyn Parson
Elizabeth Skyee Vereen
Gerald Wadley
Sarah Watson
Alex Williams

Agency Liaisons

Al Frazier, GADNR
Patrick McGuire, DOE-SR
Robert Pope, EPA
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC

DOE/Other

Helen Belencen, DOE
Jeff Bentley, DOE
Rebecca Craft, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Jim Folk, DOE
Tom Gutmann, DOE
Karen Guevara, DOE
Dave Hepner, DOE
Doug Hintze, DOE
Bill Levitan, DOE,HQ
Sherri Ross, DOE
Lance Schlag, DOE
Sheron Smith, DOE
Terry Spears, DOE
Wade Whitaker, DOE
Tiajuana Cochnauer, USFS
Ralph Phipps, USFS
David Brown, USNRC
Nishlea Devaser, USNRC
Chris Grossman, USNRC
Chris McKanney, USNRC
Gregory Suber, USNRC

Stakeholders

Tom Clements
Carol Connell
Liz Goodson
Sandra Meischen
Karen Patterson
Kristi Redmond
Chris Reno
Murray Riley

Regulators

Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Van Keisler, SCDHEC
Tom Rolka, SCDHEC
Greg Mason, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC
Eric Owens, SCDHEC

Contractors

Howard Gnann, MAS
Mike Schoener, MAS
Chris Bergren, SRNS
Steve Ashe, SRNS
Ron Bielewicz, SRNS
Sonny Goldston, SRNS
Larry Ling, SRNS
Chuck Munns, SRNS
Mike Navetta, SRNS
Paul Sauerborn, SRNS
Mtesa Wright, SRNS
Mike French, SRSRA
Ginger Dickert, WSRC
Jenny Freeman, V3
Bill Lawless, V3
Mindy Mets, V3
Eddie Watson, V3
Debbie Wisham, V3
Elmer Wilhite, SRNL

SRS CAB members Beverly Skinner and John Snedeker were unable to attend. Alex Williams led the Pledge of Allegiance for the group. Patrick McGuire, DOE-SR, served as the Deputy Designated Federal Official (DDFO); Jenny Freeman served as Meeting Facilitator; and Bill Lawless was present as the CAB's Technical Advisor. The meeting was open to the public and posted in the *Federal Register* in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Mr. McGuire, DOE-SR, shared Site safety tips with the group. A copy of the safety topic was also available to the public as a handout.

Approval of the Minutes

Ranowul Jzar, Vice Chair opened the floor for comments and approval of the March full board meeting minutes. Mr. Ortaldo commented that there is a public comment recorded on page 5 of the meeting minutes that states there are no CAB members from the Columbia area but 5 members are from the Savannah area. Mr. Ortaldo stated that the comment is incorrect, we have members from the Columbia area and he asked how to address the remark. Ms. Flemming, CAB Federal Coordinator clarified Mr. Ortaldo's remark and stated the meeting minutes provide the occurrence as it happened and cannot correct a remark even if it is not valid. Mr. McGuire established that the correction would be recorded at this time in the March meeting record.

The CAB approved with no substantial changes the January 2009 full board meeting minutes.

Agency Updates

Department of Energy

Mr. Jeff Allison, DOE-SR, welcomed the new members of the Citizens Advisory Board he encouraged them to join a committee and become fully engaged which is how they will learn about the site. In addition, he encouraged them to ask questions if they did not fully understand an issue.

Mr. Allison reported that he attended the EM SSAB meeting last week in Augusta, GA that was hosted by DOE-SR. He stated that the meeting was well attended including Dr. Ines Triay who is nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of Energy.

Mr. Allison updated the group on the status of the Liquid Waste contract which was protest after its initial award. He said it is being reviewed by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and is anticipated to be finalized by mid-April.

He said that Helen Belencan would speak to the group later that day with information about the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and stimulus funding that the site could be awarded. He said that no final funding determination has been decided. He believes the site is poised to receive funding and Ms. Belencan will go over the details with the group.

Mr. Alison established that the site is ready to progress in cleanup efforts and is anticipating making excellent progress to the mission of the site.

Mr. McGuire continued with the DOE agency updates with regard to the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF). He said the DWPF has produced over 90 canisters (against a goal of 186 canisters) during Fiscal Year 2009. He said almost 2700 glass canisters have been poured during the DWPF's lifetime and the canisters are safely stored in the Glass Waster Storage Buildings and are ready for shipment to a Federal Geological Repository.

Mr. McGuire informed the group that Tank Closure is currently focusing efforts on the F-Tank Farm, particularly, Tanks 5, 6, 18 & 19. He said that at this time, SRS is conducting mechanical cleaning with the Sand Mantis in Tanks 18 and 19 and chemical cleaning operations in Tanks 5 and 6. He acknowledged that they have experienced some delays in the mechanical cleaning in Tanks 18 and 19 due to issues with the tail wheel on both robotic crawlers, which have been corrected and will work with the regulators to ensure we all agree when tank cleaning is complete. He said Sherri Ross would brief the Board later in the afternoon on Tank Closure activities. He stated that they continue to work closely with the NRC, the EPA and SCDHEC in the review of the F-Tank Farm Performance Assessment and other analyses to support closure of Tanks 5, 6, 18 and 19 prior to the commitment date of 2012.

Mr. McGuire continued with the Solid Waste Management area stating the current focus is to complete characterization, shipping and disposal of legacy Contact Handled (CH) Transuranic (TRU) waste drums during 2009. He said the current shipping rate is 4 shipments per week and at the end of 2009, we expect to complete the legacy CH-TRU drum. He stated that SRS is preparing to begin Remote Handled (RH) TRU waste shipments to WIPP in April, and expect to complete the Battelle RH-TRU waste shipments this year. He said finally, SRS has completed installation of new, state-of-the-art Non-Destructive Assay and Non-Destructive Examination equipment for use in characterizing Boxed TRU waste as Standard Waste Boxes and Standard Large Boxes. He reported that the initial Carlsbad Field Office audit of the process would begin this week with EPA participation. He said the plan is to complete all audits and resolve all issues by May and begin shipping Standard Waste Boxes in June. He said an additional audit will be conducted in the summer to support Standard Large Box certification and prior to shipping SLBs to WIPP, the TRUPACT-III shipping container is also required and testing is scheduled for this fall.

Mr. McGuire stated that the Saltstone, Actinide Removal Process (ARP) and Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit (MCU) Facilities has completed successful outages for maintenance and upgrades and have resumed processing of salt wastes from the High Level Waste Tanks. He said that since resuming operations in January, Saltstone has solidified and permanently disposed of over 36,000 gallons of salt waste received from the ARP/MCU process, reducing environmental risk and emptying tanks for cleaning and closure. He said plans are for these key interim processing facilities to continue to treat and dispose of liquid salt waste contained in SRS waste tanks until the startup of the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF). Mr. McGuire reported that information on operation of

the ARP/MCU is being provided to the SWPF Project as lessons learned to enhance the operations of that key facility in the future.

Mr. McGuire reported the status of the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF) Project will provide the means to reduce radioactive waste volume requiring vitrification by separating low-volume/high-activity salt waste (strontium, actinides and cesium) for treatment at the Defense Waste Processing Facility from high-volume/low-activity salt waste that will be treated and disposed of at the Saltstone Facility. Salt Waste comprises the majority of the waste stored in the waste tanks at Savannah River Site. Mr. McGuire reported that in December 2008 the project obtained approval for full construction (Critical Decision-3) from the Deputy Secretary of Energy. Additionally, the Deputy Secretary approved a revised cost and schedule baseline for SWPF. He said the revised baseline cost is \$1.34B with a scheduled completion (Start of Hot Operations) of October 2015 and since January 2008 the project has completed design, completed site civil work, constructed and occupied an administrative building, completed mudmat construction and started placing concrete for construction of the basemat and first-level walls of the facility. Completion of the basemat and first-level walls is scheduled for December 2009.

Plutonium and Uranium Receipts and Disposition

Mr. McGuire said SRS continues to receive surplus, non-pit plutonium from various DOE sites and safely store the material in the Site's K-Area Complex. (12.8 Metric Tons). This campaign serves to eliminate the need for costly safeguard and security upgrades at other sites. He reported that the plutonium consolidation program is approximately 75% complete and expects to complete the consolidation of the Hanford material by September 2009. At that time, he said, 90% of the plutonium consolidation will be completed and the remaining plutonium will be received from LANL and LLNL through FY13.

Mr. McGuire stated that SRS continues to receive excess Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) from various DOE sites across the country. This campaign serves to eliminate the need for costly safeguard and security upgrades and new storage facilities at other sites. Thus far, SRS has received 65% of the 7.5 MTs of HEU. The uranium receipt program is on scheduled to complete receipts prior to September 2010. The HEU material is processed in the H-Canyon Complex facilities blended down to less than a 5% low-enriched solution and transferred offsite for fabrication by TVA into commercial reactor fuel. Since the Blendedown Program began in 2001, SRS has safely blended down and shipped 254 Metric Tons of LEU solution offsite. This material is sufficient to provide enough electricity to power all the homes in South Carolina for 11 years which is equivalent to eliminating 450 nuclear weapons, Saves taxpayers \$750 million in storage and disposal costs, and Saves TVA \$150 million in uranium costs. SRS expects to complete blending down the remaining Highly Enriched Uranium received and ship the Low Enriched Uranium offsite by September 2011 From 2012 through 2019, SRS plans to: process the SNF in H-Canyon; Recover and blendedown the uranium to a LEU solution; Ship the LEU solution offsite for fabrication into commercial reactor fuel; Disposition waste generated through the existing HLW system.

Department remains committed to H-Canyon/DWPF and MOX for plutonium disposition unless more optimal alternatives are identified.

Department remains committed to H-Canyon processing of AL-clad Spent Nuclear Fuel unless more optimal alternatives are identified.

Helen Belencan will briefly describe the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) plans for the SRS later this morning during the Strategic and Legacy Management discussions.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Mr. Rob Pope, EPA, stated that he would not run down the list of projects that are being worked on because the upcoming ARRA funding which is expected. He feels that the funding will increase projects tremendously at the site.

He described his role at the site for the new members. He said he is the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) Manager at the site which is a three party agreement between EPA, SCDHEC, and DOE, the FFA oversees the superfund cleanup of the site. He said other members of the EPA team are Hugh Hazen, Jim Barksdale, Marta Berry, in addition to several support contractors. He introduced Anna Cornelious who is a support contractor working with the superfund job training initiative.

He also informed the members of the various permits and agreements that EPA and SCDHEC oversee such as air and water permits in addition to performance Assessments.

Mr. Pope asked Mr. McGuire to clarify a statement in his update. He asked if the 36,000 gallons of salt waste had gone into salt stone, is the amount that has been treated by ARP MCU? Mr. McGuire answered yes. At that time Mr. Pope asked if there were any corresponding waste stream from that.

Mr. Spears answered yes, the circle has been closed for liquid waste processing. We've incorporated curies not only from sludge into the glass but also from the salt curries. He also clarified that 36,000 have been processed through ARP MCU this year.

Mr. Ortaldo asked if DDA is finished. Mr. Spears said that Deliquification Disolution and Adjustment (DDA) is the process in which the initial waste was taken from Tank 41. He stated it will continue from Tank 41 through this fiscal year.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC)

Ms. Shelley Wilson, SCDHEC, stated that she is looking forward to working with the new members. She introduced her team members as follows: Heather Cathcart and Van Keesler work with cleanup; Tom Rolka, Jim Brownlow, and Eric Owens work with general questions and are located in the regional Aiken office.

She stated that the department is excited about the stimulus funding which are targeted for SRS. She said they are gearing up for acceleration at the site. She said they are working with the site in scoping the General Closure Plan which is the document that is approved before any tank can be closed. She stated the process before closing a tank includes a public participation period before a decision is made on the closure plan.

She clarified her comments from the previous day with an analogy but further stated that in SC all of the groundwater is considered a potential drinking water and that is a policy decision.

Mr. Domby asked if the state has risk based standards according to the type of land use such as residential, commercial, institutional, or industrial so that the risk based standards may be something other than the maximum contamination for drinking water.

Ms. Wilson stated that for the most part they try to reach the maximum drinking water standard but it may take years to attain that so another alternative is a risk based standard which is considered a reasonable point of exposure.

Mr. Bridges asked when HLW closure plan will be issues. Ms. Wilson stated that the document has not been received yet but the target date is later this year and about five months to process after receipt.

Ms. Hayes asked how the risk basis is determined. Ms. Wilson answered that the levels are determined by EPA at the national level.

Georgia Department of Natural Resources/Environmental Protection Division (GA DNR/EPD)

Mr. Al Frazier, stated that his branch in the Environmental Protection division is the Program Coordination branch specifically the Emergency Response Environment Radiation program. He informed the group that he is the Manager of the emergency response team located in Augusta, GA. He stated that the emergency response team handles a number of environmental responses but his program has no authority over SRS but he appreciates the opportunity to be a liason with the SRS CAB.

He stated that an emergency response situation happened in GA where a tanker truck carrying sodium hydroxide left the road and landed in a stream loosing a significant amount of sodium hydroxide solution. He stated that the county ERT was able to divert the stream. He said ultimately the water was removed and treated at a remote location and replaced. He stated that luckily the drinking water downstream was not affected.

He informed the group that Shell Oil Company sponsored a drill in February where a tanker ran aground and released fuel in the Savannah River. He said it was an interesting scenario but it was successful in that it got all the response organization together to unify their actions.

He stated that the GA director of EPD notified EPA that Atlanta will become non-attainable in their ozone levels. He said that other areas in GA are Richmond, Milledgeville, and Monroe counties will also be declared non-attainable in their ground level ozone. He stated that possibly Aiken will become non-attainable in SC.

Ms. Giles asked Mr. Frazier if he knew if they would have contacted the local or state health department if it had been a real event. Mr. Frazier stated he was not sure if in the drill if health was included, but he would assume that if there was an actual gas release and an evacuation was necessary from Tybee, the health department would surely be notified.

Public Comments

No public comments

~End of Public Comments ~

Chair Update

Mr. Bettencourt, CAB Chair, gave a summary of the EM SSAB Chairs Meeting that was hosted by the SRS CAB on March 18-19, 2009 in Augusta, GA. He said that the chairs learned that they are all dealing with some of the same issues: landfill closures, scrap metal moratoriums, national budget and priority lists. He said he was pleased with the relationship that this Board has with DOE, indicating that from discussions with some of the other chairs, he learned that many of the other sites do not have near the same support. He continued by stating that each represented site was to present three top issues and an accomplishment. The top three issues presented for the SRS CAB were Liquid Waste Operations/Tank closure; Continued Operations of H-Canyon; and Plutonium Disposition. The accomplishment presented was the CAB's *Site Flow Chart* that was received with much interest. In fact, he noted DOE-HQ was interested in distributing copies of the chart to others.

He then drew members' attention to a draft letter on Yucca Mountain with CAB comments to be submitted to DOE and to be followed up with a recommendation. Mr. Bridges, Mr. Bernard, and Mr. Ortaldo made comments on the letter. Ms. Marshall recommended that members be sure of figures and historical facts. She said due to years of awaiting the opening of Yucca Mountain, she has little confidence that it will ever open. Mr. Bettencourt and Mr. Ortaldo stated that more details will be incorporated in the upcoming recommendation on this topic. For now, their hope is that Site Manager, Mr. Allison, will use this letter to speak to DOE-HQ about the concerns raised by this CAB. The Board moved to hold off voting on the letter until all changes have been incorporated. Mr. Williams moved that the letter not be sent at this time, but be attached to the recommendation that will be developed later. The Board voted in favor of "killing" the motion and would review the letter again after recommended changes are included.

Savannah River Nuclear Solutions (SRNS) – Update – Mr. Chuck Munns, SRNS

Mr. Charles "Chuck" Munns, President of the SRS managing and operating contractor, SRNS, briefed the group on what SRNS' role is on the site and within the community. He spoke about new and continuing SRS projects and the focus on safety and efficiency. He showed a concept of footprint reduction planned for the Site and mentioned future missions and activities. The work focus will be on baseline work, first, he said, then when made available, the site will look at work that can be accomplished under the Stimulus Plan.

Strategic & Legacy Management Committee, Madeleine Marshall - Chair

Presentation – Energy Parks at SRS – Dave Hepner, DOE-SR

Mr. Hepner stated that EM recognizes that as sites across the country are cleaned up, there will be excess facilities and land that could be put to other purposes and wants to leverage those assets. He said the focus is to work with the Community Reuse Organization (CRO) to make the Energy Park happen. The Energy Park will not be solely nuclear or solar. Currently, he said, the site is looking at what assets exist and what other resources are available. They are looking at leasing 2500 acres. He said the infrastructure, the natural resources, human capital, institutional control, and the technology already exists. The location being looked at, he said, is just south of the Three Rivers Landfill between Three Runs Branch and the Four Mile Branch. He said a guaranteed loan has been made available. He said that soon, within the May timeframe, the CRO will start hosting a series of public meetings to provide information and receive comments.

Ms. Marshall asked Mr. Hepner why he was talking about DOE leasing land instead of transferring it to the CRO. She said she understood that under leases, DOE can restrict the use. Mr. Hepner responded that after review, it was determined that a lease was the best way to go, but the agreement will allow either. Ms. Marshall asked what was the renewable energy. Mr. Hepner stated it was biomass.

In response to Dr. Rose Hayes, Mr. Hepner explained structure and function of the Community Reuse Organization.

Mr. Ortaldo asked Mr. Hepner to elaborate more on how spent nuclear fuel storage would be incorporated at an Energy Park. Mr. Hepner said that more information could be given once details are worked and agreed to bring an update to the CAB at a later date and would bring a representative of the CRO.

Referring to one of Mr. Hepner's slides, Ms. Shelley Wilson asked how waste management was considered an energy possibility. Mr. Hepner stated that it is expected that the technology used may very well use nuclear waste. Mr. McGuire clarified that Mr. Hepner is only presenting the initial concepts. He encouraged the CAB to provide input on what they feel the land should be used for. A good opportunity to provide input would be at the workshops that Mr. Hepner spoke of. No decisions have been made at this point.

Ms. Greene-McLeod asked if the site as a National Research Park is still being taken into consideration. Mr. Hepner answered it was.

Mr. Jayaraman stated that nuclear power would be top priority based on what is available, rather than what the community wants.

Ms. Marshall asked if there was some guarantee that this initiative will continue. Mr. Hepner stated that although it has been a number of years that different discussions have been going on, now with EM's support and corporations showing interests, we expect it to be completed.

Presentation – DOE Site Strategic Plan – Doug Hintze, DOE-SR

Mr. Hintze opened by thanking the group for the comments submitted on the Strategic Plan thus far and stated that 80-90 percent of the comments has been incorporated. He said that he brought copies of the second draft of the Plan for their review and asked for additional comments. He explained how the plan was developed and how it will support the site's current and future missions. He said the Plan's assumptions are that missions will be completed on budget and on schedule; SRNL will support EM and NNSA missions, and the site will continue to have excellent community, political, and regulatory support. The outcomes of the Plan are to cleanup environmental legacy, accelerate and perform well as we complete recovery act scope of work, convert nuclear materials into reusable materials, and dispose of non-reusable materials outside of South Carolina.

He concluded by requesting comments on the new draft Plan and stated he will accept comments around the second or third week of April as Plan is due to be finalized by end of May. But he agreed to let Ms. Marshall know the comment dates.

Mr. Castagna asked if the four facilities that are scheduled to be constructed are fully funded. Mr. Hintze said the baseline has not been established for all of them, but he knows that Salt Waste Processing Facility has been funded.

Mr. Domby asked what other public sessions are being offered? Mr. Hintze stated that the Governor's Nuclear Advisory Council and the CRO will be the primary avenues.

Ms. Marshall concluded her committee's report by reminding the group that the next committee meeting will be May 5 and will be discussing input for the budget and the Strategic Plan. Will also be looking at two new recommendations and possibly include one on the incorporation of future view in Strategic plan work to position the site for taking on future missions.

The entire presentation is available on the SRS CAB's website.

Facilitator Update

After having deferred the Facilitator Update Report earlier, Ms. Jenny Freeman, CAB Facilitator, discussed the status of SRS CAB recommendations as follows: no recommendations pending, 23 recommendations open, 236

recommendations closed, and no recommendations are awaiting Agency response. The full recommendation report may be viewed at the CAB website.

Public Comments

Tom Clements, Friends of the Earth, stated that he has been following SRS environmental issues for over 30 years and appreciates the CAB's role of monitoring what the site is doing. He thanked the local DOE and contractors for being as open as they can in sharing information and he has found that they are generally helpful. The problem he said was with DOE-HQ where there is a huge problem with community relations and transparency. He said the lack of information is severe.

Regarding Energy Parks, Mr. Clements stated he felt it may be unclear about exactly what is being proposed. The Integral Fast Reactor and the Advanced Burner Reactor are two reactors being discussed under the Global Energy Partnership Initiatives and he is concerned that the use of these type reactors would leave waste forms behind. He said he was not sure if either of these reactors is being proposed for SRS, but he, his organization, and other large organizations were strongly opposed to reprocessing. He was disappointed that the presentation was very vague. He urged the CAB to check the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's website for information on private reprocessing facilities. He stated he would like to participate in the NEPA analysis before this proposal for SRS goes out. Citizens in SC and GA, he said, will be impacted financially. He said he feels it is way too early to be discussing deployment and leasing 2500 acres of the site. He submitted written questions to the facilitator.

~ End of Public Comments ~

Mr. Bettencourt announced that after deliberating on the Yucca Mountain letter discussed earlier he has decided that it needs to be further developed prior to re-submitting for member approval and so has decided to table further discussions until a later date.

Nuclear Materials, – Don Bridges, Chair
Stan Howard – Vice Chair
Ed Burke – Vice Chair

Presentation —Footprint Reduction - Helen Belencan , DOE-SR

Ms. Belencan explained that the goal of the site is to reduce the EM footprint by 40 percent by 2011; it is not about reducing the full 310 square miles of the site, but about accelerating the cleanup so that the land can become available for other activities that's appropriate and of interest for the community. She stated that at the SSAB Chairs Meeting the past week, Ms. Triay, Acting Assistant Secretary for EM, stated that Energy Parks are options but only if communities wanted it. SRS has gotten feedback that there is interest and is looking at using money from the Recovery Act to make it happen; although, the money has not yet been received and exact figures are not certain.

She explained that SRS is recognized as a national asset, which is one reason it is a recipient of Recovery Act dollars. She explained the site's mission, and vision. If the site can get some footprint reduction, she said, it can focus on tank waste and nuclear materials and makes way for new missions. This was the foundation of the Strategic Plan.

Ms. Belencan stated what the site's baseline looked like in 2008, and said that it was apparent that in order for the site to be more effective, something would have to happen; the Recovery Act was that something.

She explained that Ms. Triay saw the business proposal developed by SRS, which explained how if the site received additional funding in the near term for dealing with soil and groundwater remediation, decommissioning, and TRU waste disposition, it could free up some land, focus on liquid waste and nuclear materials. The proposal showed how the site could show a return on that investment in savings in the total cost for cleanup, as work would be completed sooner. Dr. Triay's vision was to connect environmental cleanup with reuse of the resources at SRS for things like Energy Parks or returning the land back to the community. Ms. Belencan said Dr. Triay knew that whoever won the presidency would have to focus on energy in order to look for new strategies to resolve the nation's energy needs. That vision, she said, rolled into the Recovery Act plans. Although funds have not yet been given, the EM program is to receive \$6 billion in Recovery Act funding that will help do more in areas like the TRU waste program. Another purpose of this funding is to create near-term environmental cleanup jobs with an eye for lasting economic benefits.

Project oversight of the Recovery Act activities will be significant, she said. Safety is the priority regardless of how accelerated the schedule. The site will continue to work with SCDHEC and have already met to discuss the work scope and what it means to their organization. Every step will be taken to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

Referring to slides, she reviewed each area of the scope with the group to include some infrastructure work.

Mr. Bettencourt asked Ms. Belencan what TRU waste would be left after the campaign. She responded it would be the entire legacy TRU waste left in inventory with the expectation that TRU waste will be generated over time from regular operations and TRU Pad I will be completed. She said the site has worked closely with Carlsbad understanding that what the site does would certainly increase their workload, as well.

Ms. Marshall stated that there will also be increased work on the state, which would impact its budget, and considering how the governor was reluctant to accept some of the funding, she wanted to know how that impact might be handled. Ms. Belencan stated that the site intends to increase the grant funding with each agency to compensate for the increased workload. All actions will be evaluated and documented in a Record of Decision. After funding has been received, she said, a website: www.site.recovery@srs.gov, with a link to the EM Recovery website, will be available for public to get information. In addition, she assured that the site would provide continuous updates on the Recovery Act activities, as it develops.

Waste Management Committee, Joe Ortaldo – Chair

Art Dombey – Vice Chair (Liquid Waste)

Alex Williams – Vice Chair (Solid Waste)

Mr. Ortaldo updated the group on the committee activities saying the last meeting was on March 10th and Sherri Ross gave a presentation on waste determination and tank closure. He said Tom Canti, NNSA, attended the meeting and updated the group on the progress of the MOX waste solidification building. He stated that the update addressed the committees' recommendation 255 which suggested that the DOE and NNSA utilizing existing EM facilities to save in the cost of the facility. He said the presentation addressed the committee's Recommendations 224, 162, 135. He said that Sonni Blanco also presented the critical path schedule update on the Salt Waste Processing Facility. Mr. Ortaldo stated that all the presentation from the committee meeting are available on the CAB website.

Mr. Ortaldo announced that Recommendations 231 and 245 would be closed based on the presentation given to the committee on January 13, 2009. At last committee meeting he asked members to forward their comments about Recommendation 255 to him and if none are received the recommendation would be closed.

He stated that on March 12th he attended the Governor's Nuclear Advisory Council where there was a tremendous amount of discussion on the Yucca Mountain issue and the future of a repository.

Presentation – Status of Waste Determination and Tank Closure Status – Sherri Ross, Waste Removal and Tank Closure Project Manager, DOE-SR

Ms. Ross updated the group on the status of the SRS Tank Closure Program including waste removal; the overall closure process; and the F Tank Farm Performance Assessment.

She informed the group that mechanical cleaning with the Sand Mantis crawler on Tanks 18 and 19 is underway. She said it is challenging but effective and it's anticipated to remove approximately 75% residual heel removal at completion. She also said that chemical cleaning with oxalic acid on Tanks 5 and 6. Ms. Ross described the Sand Mantis crawler for the group and the design improvement implemented.

Ms. Ross stated in regards to F Tank Farm Performance Assessment Comments Comments received from South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control; Environmental Protection Agency; Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and the Citizen's Advisory Board Waste Management Committee. She said they are excellent comments that will improve overall readability and quality of the document and that no new modeling is anticipated at this time. She said the F Tank Farm performance assessment would be revised to incorporate the comments received.

Ms. Parsons asked where the waste that is taken out with the Sand Mantis' is going. Ms. Ross said the waste coming out of the tanks is being treated for disposal at the salt waste facility and the sludge is going to the DWPF to be vitified.

Presentation – Waste Determination and Tank Closure Status – Marty Letourneau, Office of Compliance , DOE-HQ

From HQ perspective, Mr. Letourneau stated he wanted the group to understand that Section 3113 applies only to South Carolina and Idaho. Different sets of requirements are needed for other states. Very first waste determination was done at SRS on Saltstone. Lessons learned were applied at Idaho. Received staff input in many scoping meetings to determine what should be put into the performance assessment. The assessment has undergone a technical review and comments submitted by the NRC. The assessment has not yet been approved by the NRC, but the comments were very helpful. The assessment was also reviewed by DOE-HQ, he said, and they are now awaiting to complete the waste determination. The same process will have to be conducted for the H-Tank Farm. The NRC will be monitoring our waste disposal activities.

He spoke also of what activities were being done towards achieving a waste determination at Idaho and West Valley. He said they are applying and sharing lessons learned, and technologies, and working closely with the NRC staff. He added that the NRC staff would be conducting a monitoring over the next two days regarding the completed assessment on Saltstone to ensure performance objectives are being met.

Other initiatives he mentioned were an update to the DOE Waste Management Order (435.1). Order was issued in July 1999 to do internal waste management of anything radioactive that's not RCRA. Updates are warranted by lessons learned over the past 10 years, things that changed, and new guidance's that should be incorporated. They now plan to do a complex-wide review, he said, and teams are being formed to conduct them. They will also send letters to program managers to understand cross-cutting programs. He said they expect to kick things off within the next couple of months.

Mr. Ortaldo asked if Hanford would be getting under 3116. Mr. Letourneau said there has been talk, but was unsure.

Rob Pope, EPA, suggested that when they send the letters to the site managers, also send to EPA-HQ managers and impacted states. Mr. Pope explains that the different agencies tend try to get to the same place in different ways. Mr. Letourneau agreed to the idea.

Mr. Williams asked how what Mr. Letourneau was attempting now impacted SRS' old radioactive waste burial ground. Mr. Letourneau said it does not because the waste in the burial ground is more than likely pre-1988 and the order does not address it.

Mr. Bill Levitan, Head of Office of Compliance, DOE-HQ, added comments to Mr. Williams' question stating that Dr. Triay has asked them to get creative and there may be avenues that will address this type of waste.

Presentation – Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) – Dave Brown, DOE-SR

Mr. Brown introduced other site and NRC agency representatives present and displayed a newly launched website for information. He then said DOE and the NRC have a long history of working together. As of 2004, he said, Congress has tasked his office with consulting with DOE on waste determinations and continue to monitor after determinations are made.

Regarding the ongoing monitoring of Saltstone and the consultation of the F-tank Farm PA, the waste determination was completed in 2005 and a monitoring plan was drawn up. There were 39 areas that the office wanted to monitor and internal staff guidance was established to state what NRC understands what is to happen. (Doc #1911, Rev. 1). His office can ask for and review DOE documents, if needed. The first monitoring visit after approving the determination in 2005 was in 2007. Regarding the F-Tank Farm PA, they have been working in meetings with DHEC and EPA since 2006 that culminated into a PA in 2008. Comments on the PAs include what the comment is, the basis for it, and the path forward.

The next step, he said, following the consultation phase and have issued 90 comments, will discuss the comments to be sure they are understood, and will be the receipt of the waste determination sometimes next year. Then a monitoring plan will be developed.

Mr. Williams asked what was the impact of his report on DOE and if they must follow the recommendations. Mr. Brown said when they provide comments to DOE, they do it, but NRC could, if needed, report their findings to the Congressional Oversight Committee.

Mr. Domby asked Mr. Brown if he felt that implementing the NRC comments will be adequately supported. Mr. Brown stated he could not predict how it will result in any evolution of the PA. Mr. Domby then asked about the amount of drinking water assumptions and if it made a difference that they slightly differ. Mr. Brown said no. Mr. Domby then asked where the reference to 40 thousand years came from for peak dose analysis. Mr. Brown stated it's because they wanted to know where the peak dose would occur, even if it's not in the point of compliance. So it's done for insight.

Mr. Ortaldo asked when will we have your comments on the PA. Sherri Ross stated that they are currently working on comment resolution and do not anticipate any major impact and should be completed in May.

Public Comments

No public comments.

~End of Public Comments ~

Meeting adjourned 4:20 p.m.

Handouts

Handouts listed herein are available by contacting the SRS Citizens Advisory Board at 1-800-249-8155.

Agenda
Budget Briefing and Integrated Priority List Input
Savannah River Nuclear Solutions – Update
Energy Park at SRS
SRS Strategic Plan
Waste Determination and Tank Closure Status