



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Environmental Remediation and Waste Management Subcommittee

Meeting Record

November 16, 1998
Adam's Mark Hotel
Columbia, SC

The SRS CAB ER&WM Subcommittee met on November 16, 1998, at the Adam's Mark Hotel in Columbia, SC. Bill Lawless opened the meeting with introductions. Participants included the following:

| <u>CAB Members</u> | <u>Stakeholders</u> | <u>DOE/Contractor</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Bill Lawless | Todd Crawford | Gerri Flemming (ADDFO) |
| Kathryn May | Craig Mariner (SCDHEC) | Sonny Goldston |
| Karen Patterson | Lee Poe | Elmer Wilhite |
| Wade Waters | Harry B James IV | Helen Villasor |
| | Kenneth SajWan | Paul Sauerborn |
| | Stacey Argrow | Brian Hennessey |
| | Lynn Waishwell (CRESP) | Steve Piccolo |
| | Julie Corkran (EPA) | Bill Noll |
| | Ann Clark (SCDHEC) | Mike Griffith |
| | Jeff Crane (EPA) | |

There were no public comments during the first public comment period.

Bill Lawless proceeded with the meeting by designating presenters and motion managers for the draft motions to be presented to the full Board on November 17, 1998:

1. Salt Disposition - Steve Piccolo - presenter, Wade Waters - motion manager
2. Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground - Mike Griffith - presenter, Kathryn May - motion manager
3. Low Level Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (WMPEIS) - Sonny Goldston - presenter, Karen Patterson - motion manager
4. Intermodal Transportation - Bill Noll - presenter, Bill Lawless - motion manager

Mr. Lawless suggested that if any comments were to be made on the motions at this meeting they may be offered before, during, or after the motion reviews.

During the review of the WMPEIS Low Level Waste (LLW) Preferred Alternatives draft motion, it was noted that on August 17, 1998, representatives from the DOE Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) met in Las Vegas, NV and options for the disposal of low-level and mixed low-level waste were discussed. At that meeting, Brendolyn Jenkins, representing the SRS CAB suggested that a useful method of getting input from the various SSABs would be to have each SSAB rank order the options. This suggestion was accepted by the meeting participants. To be useful to DOE in selecting preferred alternatives input from

the SSABs, it was mentioned that SRS CAB input needed to be provided by November 30, 1998. Bill Lawless responded to questions concerning the timing of submitting a recommendation at this time and explained that based on the information package which had been sent to the SSABs by DOE, now is the window of opportunity for the SRS CAB to provide comments. Mr. Lawless noted that timing was especially important since a request had also been sent to DOE-HQ requesting an extension on the public comment period until November 30, 1998, so that the draft motion could be presented to the SRS CAB at its full Board meeting on November 17, 1998. Mr. Lee Poe then discussed portions of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Record of Decision (ROD) process. Bill Noll explained that the Secretary of Energy is asking for public comments now. Mr. Noll noted that after the public comment period is over, the Secretary will then use that information to assist in the decision-making process. It was mentioned that at a National Governor's Association (NGA) meeting, the states asked that before the preferred DOE option is published in the Federal Register, DOE sit down with state representatives and discuss the Secretary's decision. There were also various discussions on whether DOE would just tell the states what the decision would be or if DOE would actually enter into negotiations with the states at that point in time and before the preferred option would be published in the Federal Register. Ann Clark noted that DOE committed to the states at the NGA meeting that they would discuss the preferred alternative with the affected sites prior to the publication of the preferred alternative in the Federal Register. Sonny Goldston then briefed the attendees on the available options being proposed to dispose of both low-level and mixed low-level waste and discussed the criteria the ER&WM Subcommittee had used to select their preferred alternatives on both waste types. Karen Patterson read the draft motion paragraph by paragraph so that comments could be made along the way. Ann Clark expressed that SCDHEC was not in support of the motion and advised the subcommittee that SCDHEC felt the subcommittee had not explored all of the implications of the motion.

The next draft to be discussed was Intermodal Transportation. Instead of a full draft motion, Bill Lawless suggested to the subcommittee that a letter of support from the SRS CAB be provided to the Nevada Test Site Community Advisory Board (NTSCAB). Bill Noll talked briefly about the proposed action of DOE - Nevada, which is to encourage approved low-level radioactive waste generators and their transportation contractors to use transportation alternatives that would further minimize radioactive risk and enhance safety. Copies of the letter approved by the NTSCAB and sent to Mr. Carl Gertz, DOE Assistant Manager of the Nevada Operations Office was distributed as well as the draft letter prepared by the SRS CAB ER&WM Subcommittee. The SRS letter focused on the national picture of the transportation plans for all of DOE's wastes not just LLW and how will transporting other wastes and LLW impact NTS, SRS, and the complex as a whole.

In-Tank Precipitation (ITP) was the next topic. Mr. Steve Piccolo provided an overview of the High Level Waste (HLW) Tank System that is currently operating. Mr. Piccolo said that SRS is in the process of a system study to evaluate and make a recommendation based on the investigation performed by the Multidiscipline Systems Engineering Team (Salt Disposition Team) as well as other review panels such as the SRS CAB Focus Group, led by Mr. Lee Poe. Mr. Piccolo discussed the process of Phase I, which was the Identification of potential solutions; Phase II, Technical Risk/Investigation where weighted evaluation criteria led to four selected alternatives; and Phase III, Selection/Recommendation that covered science and technology, engineering, cost and schedule and finally the recommendation of primary and backup selections. The primary selection consists of Small Tank Tetraphenyl Borate (TPB) Precipitation and the backup recommendation which consists of Crystalline Silicotitanate (CST) Non-elutable Ion Exchange. Mr. Piccolo commended the Focus Group on its diligent participation and for providing a comprehensive independent review of the WSRC process for the selection of HLW salt disposition alternatives. Wade Waters read through the draft motion which agreed with the process developed and used by the Salt Disposition Team for evaluating the alternatives. The draft motion also supported the dual-track approach and continued work on both the primary and backup alternatives. Lee Poe asked for changes to the last sentence that were agreed to. Bill Lawless pointed out that the preferred alternative of small tank ITP was an excellent choice; while some expressed reservations with that choice because large tank ITP had failed. Mr. Lawless noted "that there are always problems with the development of the new technologies, that if what goes wrong can be fixed, we'd be in a stronger technological position, and that choosing an

unproved alternative did not guarantee that later on it would develop unforeseen problems when it became a full-scale technology, which would put us back where we are today."

The last draft motion discussed was the Closure of the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground (ORWBG). Mike Griffith provided a brief status of the clean-up process at the ORWBG and the intent to solicit input from the CAB concerning the remedial alternatives under consideration for the final remediation of the ORWBG. Mr. Griffith indicated that the intent is to involve the public early on in the process since no final decisions have been made to date. However, Mr. Griffith indicated that the Corrective Measure Study/Feasibility Study (CMS/FS) will be submitted to SCDHEC and EPA in March 1999. Kathryn May read the draft motion which recommended that the CAB form a public Focus Group to evaluate and recommend remediation alternatives for closure of the 76-acre ORWBG and that the Focus Group work with the three agencies (DOE, EPA and SCDHEC) in reviewing the alternatives and selected the preferred remedies for closure. Bill Lawless requested that Dr. Joel Massman provide questions on the southwest groundwater plume from the old Burial Ground for the meeting with the regulators on November 19, 1998, and to work with the public focus group.

There were no public comments during the final comment period and Bill Lawless closed the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

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