Citizens Advisory Board
Committee Minutes

INL Site Environmental Management
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

Committee:	Full Board
Date:	Thursday, January 28, 2010 – 9:30 a.m. (MT)
	Participants
Board Members:	Tami Sherwood, April Mariska, Bruce Wendle, Fred Sica, Doc DeTonancour, R.D. Maynard, Willie Preacher, Seth Beal, Teri Tyler
DOE-ID:	Bob Pence, Jeff Perry, Robin Paul
Liaisons:	Daryl Koch
Support Staff:	Lisa Aldrich, Ceri Chapple, Lori Isenberg

Objective(s) for the Committee Call

- EBR II EE/CA Discussion

The conference call was held because the CAB had many additional questions regarding the EBR-II EE/CA. Jeff Perry fielded questions from the full board.

Ms. Karst inquired if the lead on painted surfaces was inside or outside of the buildings. Mr. Perry responded that the lead was on the inside and would be grouted in place. He added that everything above ground will be removed with a grouted monolith over the plugs.

Ms. Karst asked what the meaning of the phrase "void spaces grouted as practicable" meant on page 8-1. Mr. Perry explained that is a DOE, EPA, and DEQ term that has been adopted which is a combining concept whereby they will be able to perform activity and will do so by grouting every space possible. Daryl Koch added that the grout will not be under pressure and not every tiny spot will have grout.

Bruce Wendle inquired as to why EBR-II isn't being turned into a historical monument like EBR-I. Jeff Perry explained that there is a need to exhibit an ability to appropriately dispose of a reactor building. The INL cultural resource management plan identifies how historical structures are qualified. A category 1 structure in the historic American engineering report meets all of those criteria.

Willie Preacher asked how footprint reduction can be justified in this approach to EBR-II. Mr. Perry explained that footprint reduction will not be justified with the grouting approach to the reactor. He said that he would get back to Mr. Preacher regarding the overall footprint reduction of EBR-II. Mr. Koch interjected, explaining that footprint reduction needs to be looked in regards to ongoing missions.

Tami Sherwood asked what the difference is between building 601 and building 640. Mr. Perry explained that they will leave 11 feet above ground because of the exposure risk to the workforce and the elevated costs associated with removal to ground level.

R.D. Maynard asked if the exposure to the worker is less in Alternative #4 than with Alternative #3. Mr. Perry emphasized that it is just the opposite. The long-term environmental exposure would be less with Alternative #4

than with Alternative #3, however Alternative #4 poses a much greater risk to the worker, it is likely that every worker would exceed their yearly exposure rates. Under Alternative #3 the monolith will have long-term monitoring.

Mr. Maynard inquired if there is current well monitoring at MFC for the EBR-II area. Mr. Perry said that he wasn't sure but would try to get that information.

Seth Beal asked if the current monitoring wells will suffice for future monitoring of possible leakage from the EBR-II site. Mr. Perry explained that those wells would suffice for monitoring any radionuclides that might be released from EBR-II because they would be indigenous of that facility.

Mr. Wendle inquired id any negative results or problems can be associated with the monolith's location. Mr. Perry said that there is no foreseen future use of the area.

Mr. Wendle questioned how the dome will be removed. Mr. Perry responded that it is going to be an incredibly difficult job. They will build towers around the dome and haul pieces of it out on a kin-of rail system. There are still many engineering solutions to be developed.

Mr. Wendle proposed an Alternative #5 whereby the dome would be left in pace and grout the entire structure, leaving a 90 foot monolith. Mr. Perry said that alternative was not considered in the EE/Ca however he encourages the CAB to possibly write that alternative into the recommendation. He explained that the non-contaminated waste will go to MFC D&D landfill; therefore there will not be an increased footprint with Alternative #3.

Willie Preacher inquired as to how the secure the weight will be after grouting. Jeff Perry explained that the building has a very robust foundation; however he is not exactly sure about possible impacts to the foundation.

Tami Sherwood asked how far underground the foundation is. Mr. Perry answered that the foundation lies 60-80 feet below grade.

Fred Sica was also conserved if the foundation would be strong enough to handle the extra weight from the grout. Mr. Perry said that he would look into that.

Teri Tyler added that the building would have been built to withstand heavy seismic activity.

R.D. Maynard inquired about the long-term management plans associated with Alternative #3 & #4. Mr. Perry explained that in WAG-9 calls for contracts long-term monitoring surveillance of the area, and the EBR-II facility would be included in that sub-cost, assuming no additional wells are needed.

Mr. Maynard expressed some confusion regarding the radiological inventory numbers listed in 4-1. Ms. Mariska concurred, wondering if Mr. Perry could possibly provide a comparative chart that dealt directly with human health risks. Mr. Koch explained that those numbers are necessary for the agencies. Mr. Perry said that he will send the board the EDF that explains the curries and the direct dose related man.

R.D. Maynard inquired if grouting made SR-90 become mobile. Mr. Perry said yes, grouting will cause Strontium-90 to become mobile; however the grout will not be pressurized. The only way the SR-90 could mobilize into the groundwater would be if the concrete itself became soluble.

Doc DeTonancour emphasized that worker exposure is a paramount issue. Mr. Perry agreed, saying that the big difference between Alternative #3 and Alternative #4 is the exposure to the workforce.

Mr. Wendle asked if there was any risk associated to the workers with Alternative #3. Mr. Perry answered that there is little risk, the processing equipment will remove the dome and workers will shielded and protected. The reactor will be grouted first before the dome is removed.

Action Items:

- Mr. Perry will provide the CAB with the EDF
- Mr. Perry will gather more information regarding footprint reduction for Willie Preacher's inquiry.
- Mr. Perry will get information regarding well monitoring and additional costs associated.
- Mr. Perry will gather information associated with the EBR-II foundation.
- The CAB will draft a recommendation.
- Recommendation committee: R.D. Maynard, Fred Sica, Harrison Gerstlauer, Willie Preacher, and Damond Watkins.

To review the details of this meeting, call 1-888-284-7564, playback code 215587.