Document #0019: Comments 19.1 – 19.2
City of Oak Ridge, Office of the Mayor

CITY OF
OAK RIDGE

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

POST OFFICE BOX 1 • OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE 37831-0001

July 9, 2003

0019
RECEIVED
JUL 14 2003

Mr. Daniel P. Sullivan
WVDP WM EIS
10282 Rock Springs Road, WV-49
West Valley, NY 14171-9799

West Valley Demonstration Project Draft Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0337D)

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

It has come to the attention of the City of Oak Ridge that the subject Department of Energy (DOE) environmental impact statement (EIS) identifies interim storage at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) as an option (not DOE's preferred alternative) for management of transuranic (TRU) radioactive waste from the West Valley, New York, Demonstration Project site.

The City of Oak Ridge strongly opposes the transfer of West Valley TRU waste to Oak Ridge for interim storage. The DOE has not been able to arrange for the timely removal of TRU waste that is already stored here, and it would not be in the best interest of our community to increase the inventory of stored TRU waste by importing additional material from another DOE site. 19.1

Also, please note that the EIS has an error regarding the location of the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR). Text on pages S-16 and 3-26 states that the ORR is located west of Knoxville "in the rolling terrain between the Cumberland Mountains and the Great Smoky Mountains." This incorrectly implies that the ORR is in the middle of an uninhabited region. There is no mention of the City of Oak Ridge, within whose city limits almost all of the ORR (including ORNL) lies. Descriptions of the other candidate management sites correctly identify the nearest cities. Please correct the description of the ORR to state that it is in the City of Oak Ridge. 19.2

Sincerely,

David R. Bradshaw

David R. Bradshaw
Mayor

cc: Gerald Boyd, Manager, DOE Oak Ridge Operations
Stephen McCracken, Assistant Manager for Environmental Management, DOE Oak Ridge Operations

Document #0019: Responses

19.1. The WM PEIS studied the potential for nationwide impacts of managing radioactive and hazardous wastes. DOE issued separate RODs for all of the waste types analyzed in the WM PEIS. For TRU waste, DOE decided that each site that has generated or would generate TRU waste would store it onsite prior to shipment to WIPP for disposal (63 Fed. Reg. 3629 (1998)). However, the Department may decide to ship TRU waste from sites where it may be impractical to prepare it for disposal to other sites where DOE has or will have the necessary capability. The sites that could receive TRU waste from other sites are INEEL, ORR, SRS, and the Hanford Site.

Thus, DOE's analysis in the Draft and Final WVDP Waste Management EISs of the disposal or interim storage of WVDP waste is consistent with analyses conducted for the WM PEIS and with decisions reached on the basis of that document.

However, the shipment of waste to offsite locations for interim storage is not DOE's preferred alternative. Under the preferred alternative (Alternative A), TRU waste and HLW would continue to be stored at the WVDP site until such time as disposal offsite could be arranged.

19.2. DOE corrected the description of ORR in the Final EIS (see Section 3.9.5).

THE SENECA NATION OF INDIANS

P.O. Box 231
Salamanca, New York 14779
Phone (716) 945-1790
Fax (716) 945-1565

1490 Rt. 438
Irving, New York 14081
Phone (716) 532-4900
Fax (716) 532-6272

PRESIDENT ..... *Rickey L. Armstrong, Sr., 62 Eagle St., Salamanca, NY 14779*
CLERK ..... *Sheila L. Kettle, 3510 West Loop Road, Salamanca, NY 14779*
TREASURER ..... *Shelley R. Huff, P.O. Box 157, Lawtons, NY 14091*

0020
RECEIVED
JUL 2 3 2003

July 10, 2003

Mr. Daniel Sullivan
U.S. Department of Energy
West Valley Demonstration Project
10282 Rock Springs Road
West Valley, NY 14171

SUBJECT: Comments on West Valley Demonstration Project Waste Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

My staff has completed its review of the above–referenced document and prepared the attached comments.

As you know, the activities at the West Valley Demonstration Project have the potential to directly affect our communities on the Cattaraugus and Allegany territories. After reading this DEIS and the alternatives for shipping stored waste off of the site, it is not possible to determine the extent of impact to either of our communities, since the transportation routes are not identified. 20.1 In addition, although the risks of implementing the alternatives are reported to be very low, we are not certain the risk assessment considered factors unique to our population. 20.2

We support your efforts to meet challenges in cleaning up and closing down the West Valley Demonstration Project. We trust that the US Department of Energy will work with our government in finalizing this impact statement and reaching the Record of Decision, as per Executive Order 13084, the Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments Executive Memorandum of April 29, 1994, and the US Department of Energy's American Indian and Alaska Native Tribal Government Policy. I am confident that the DOE will continue to improve environmental conditions at the site. By working with us on a government-to-government basis, we can have a positive role in

ensuring that our future generations are not harmed by a legacy of waste left behind at the West Valley Demonstration Project.

Please call Lisa Maybee or Gayla Gray, at 716-532-2546/4900 if you should have any questions regarding our comments.

Sincerely,

Rickey L. Armstrong, Sr., President
SENECA NATION OF INDIANS

cc: EPD
Bryan Bower, DOE WVDP

0020
RECEIVED
JUL 2 3 2003

Document #0020: Comments 20.3 – 20.13
The Seneca Nation of Indians

Page/Section	Comment	
General Comment	How will our pertinent comments from the 1996 draft environmental impact statement be identified and applied to the development of this EIS?	20.3
1-1, first bullet	To our knowledge, the proposed Yucca Mountain Repository is not a geologic repository because the site's geology alone will not contain the waste. Waste placed in Yucca Mountain will require stewardship in perpetuity. We suggest changing to "federal repository" here and throughout the document.	20.4
1-11	Why isn't Greater-Than-Class C waste considered under the alternatives?	20.5
1-13, Table 1-1	The table should include a definition of Class A low level waste since this waste type is shipped under all alternatives.	20.6
2-9 through 2-11, Section 2.2.3	Does LSA 1 contain 37,000 cubic feet of low level waste (i.e., storage capacity minus available storage space)? These descriptions of the waste storage areas do not include the amount of waste stored in each area. Why not do the math? Since this DEIS is supposed to focus on waste management, it would be helpful to the reader to state the quantity of waste currently managed in these areas.	20.7
2-13, Table 2-2, Number of Shipments	Does this column enumerate truck *plus* rail shipments for the given number of containers, or truck *or* rail shipments for the given number of containers? Does rail mean railcar? What determines whether a shipment occurs by truck or by railcar?	20.8
2-14, second full paragraph	Do all of these disposal sites have rail service?	20.9
3-5, second paragraph	Cattaraugus Creek water is used to irrigate tomato fields in Chautauqua County.	20.10
3-23, Figure 3-8	Oil Spring Reservation is incorrectly identified. It is on the border between Allegany and Cattaraugus Counties. The correct spelling is Allegany Reservation.	20.11
3-25	What roads and railroads serve the area around Envirocare?	20.12
4-1, second	There is a potential for direct and indirect impacts fro	20.13

RECEIVED
JUL 23 2003
0020

Document #0020: Comments 20.13 – 20.21
The Seneca Nation of Indians

Page/Section	Comment	
paragraph, 4th sentence	transportation. How and where are these impacts evaluated?	20.13
4-2, Section 4.1.1, & C-3, Table C-2	Non-fatal health effects to the exposed population should also be evaluated. This section should state how the evaluation of human health impacts considers the overall health of the person receiving the dose. The very young, elderly, and persons with compromised health due to diabetes or high blood pressure (for example) may be more susceptible to non-fatal or fatal cancers. How does the evaluation consider people who practice a subsistence lifestyle? The risk assessment should include exposures from consuming venison, inhaling wood smoke (i.e., burning firewood from trees that preferentially uptake radionuclides), inhaling water vapor from Cattaraugus Creek and Lake Erie, drinking surface water *and* groundwater, and consuming fish from Cattaraugus Creek.	20.14 20.15
4-6, Section 4.2.1	Who is the maximally exposed individual?	20.16
4-7, Section 4.2.2, first paragraph, second sentence	What causes the higher impact from rail transportation?	20.17
Sections 4.3.2, 4.4.2, 4.5.2	What would be the impacts from a terrorist attack?	20.18
Sections 4.3.3.3, 4.4.3.3, 4.5.3.3	It is unclear who the maximally exposed individual (MEI) is for these scenarios or why the MEI's dose is less than the population's dose. Who comprises the population? If individuals in the population experience the greater health effect, wouldn't they be the MEI?	20.19
5-1, fourth paragraph	This paragraph needs clarification. What is the definition of "past operations" in the second sentence? Does "past operations" mean during reprocessing and/or 1982 to present? This dose was 13 person-rem, but the fourth sentence parenthetically says the radiation dose to workers and the public in the past was 2.5 person-rem.	20.20
Appendix C	Appendix C does not describe the assumptions or methodology used to assess ecological risk, as per the draft technical standard on a graded approach for evaluating radiation doses to aquatic and terrestrial biota.	20.21

RECEIVED
JUL 23 2003
0020

Document #0020: Comments 20.22 – 20.25
The Seneca Nation of Indians

Page/Section	Comment	
C-27	It is disingenuous to average the dose over an area having a 50-mile radius when the dose is not experienced equally across this area. The dose is primarily received by the people living downwind of the site, by people who access Cattaraugus Creek and its tributaries leading from the site, and by people who use the natural and agricultural resources growing in areas that are impacted by releases from the site. What are the doses to these people?	20.22
D-19, Section D.6.7, first paragraph	This paragraph acknowledges that other delayed health effects can occur and gives the conversion factors; however, total risks are not conveyed to the reader in Section D.7 (Results).	20.23
D-27, Alternative A	Isn't the probability of a truck accident greater than that for rail?	20.24
D-27 & D-28, Alternatives A & B	A severe accident under each of these alternatives would result in three latent cancer fatalities for the exposed population and a 0.012 risk of latent cancer fatality for the maximally exposed individual. If individuals in the population experience the greater health effect, wouldn't they be the MEI?	20.25

0020
RECEIVED
JUL 2 3 2003

3

Document #0020: Responses

20.1. DOE analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with the transportation of radioactive waste from the WVDP site to each of the other locations included in this EIS for disposal or interim storage in Chapter 4 (see Sections 4.1.2, 4.2.2, 4.3.3, 4.4.3, and 4.5.3) and Appendix D. DOE routinely plans actual transportation campaigns well in advance, with appropriate notice to affected State and local jurisdictions along the transportation route. DOE has long maintained a transportation program that provides assistance to all affected States and local jurisdictions in maintaining emergency preparedness capabilities, including training, and DOE transportation personnel remain available for assistance during transportation campaigns in the event of an incident.

20.2. In Section 4.6, the Draft EIS addressed the subsistence consumption of fish from Cattaraugus Creek. For atmospheric releases of radioactivity material from the WVDP site, the EIS considered the inhalation of radioactive gases and particulates in the air, ingestion of cultivated crops, and external exposure from radioactive material in the air or on the ground. Inhaling radioactive material in wood smoke or water vapor was not considered in the analysis. However, because of the dispersion of wood smoke and dilution by the water in Cattaraugus Creek or Lake Erie, the radiation doses through these pathways would be much lower than inhaling the radioactive material directly from the air, which is analyzed in the Draft and Final EISs. Ingestion of surface water and groundwater was not included because there is no documented use of local surface water or downgradient groundwater wells as drinking water by local residents.

The WVDP Annual Site Environmental Monitoring Reports address the inhalation of radioactive gases and particulates in air; ingestion of cultivated crops; and ingestion of fish, beef, and milk.

20.3. DOE reviewed comments received on the Draft Cleanup and Closure EIS issued in 1996 and found that they addressed only closure and related issues. For this reason, all of those comments are being considered in the context of the continuation of the 1996 Draft Cleanup and Closure EIS, which is now known as the Decommissioning and/or Long-Term Stewardship EIS.

20.4. As explained in the Yucca Mountain Repository EIS, DOE considers the repository to be a geologic repository.

20.5. The only Greater-than-Class-C waste at WVDP is NYSERDA pre-Project waste in the NRC-licensed Disposal Area and the State-licensed Disposal Area. The disposition of these wastes will be evaluated in the Decommissioning and/or Long-Term Stewardship EIS.

20.6. A definition of Class A LLW was added to Table 1-1 in the Final EIS.

20.7. Class A waste continues to be shipped and the waste stored onsite is moved among the available storage facilities to increase efficiency. Thus, the waste volume and type of waste stored in each facility changes frequently. For this reason, DOE did not include the waste volumes stored in each location, but rather included the storage capacity of each facility and the total volumes of waste to be shipped.

20.8. In Table 2-2, the "Number of Shipments" column shows the number of truck shipments required to ship 145,000 cubic feet of Class A LLW under the No Action Alternative and the number of rail shipments required to ship 145,000 cubic feet of Class A LLW under the No Action Alternative. Rail means shipment in railcars; the analysis assumes that each rail shipment involves one railcar (see Appendix D, Section D.4). In practice, the decision on whether to use truck or rail depends on many factors, such as shipping container availability, efficiency, schedule, operational constraints, and cost.

20.9. All of the sites considered in this EIS but Nevada Test Site and the Yucca Mountain repository have direct rail access. Text was added to Section 3.9 and Section D.3 to clarify this.

20.10. This information was added to Section 3.2.1 in the Final EIS.

20.11. These corrections were made in the Final EIS (Figure 3-8).

20.12. This information was added to Section 3.9.1 in the Final EIS.

20.13. DOE analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with the transportation of radioactive waste from the WVDP site to other locations for disposal or interim storage in Chapter 4 (see Sections 4.1.2, 4.2.2, 4.3.3, 4.4.3, and 4.5.3) and Appendix D.

20.14. DOE's analyses recognize that the principal potential human health effect from exposure to low doses of radiation is cancer. In Appendix C of the EIS (both draft and final), DOE explains that other health effects such as nonfatal cancers and genetic effects can occur as a result of chronic exposure to radiation. Inclusion of the total incidence of nonfatal cancers and severe genetic effects from radiation exposure increases the total detriment by 40 to 50 percent, compared to the change for latent cancer fatalities (see Appendix C, Section C.1). Estimates of latent cancer

fatalities as a result of waste management activities (including transportation) are provided for each alternative. The risk factor used for estimating potential latent cancer fatalities in the general population takes into account that children (who are more susceptible to adverse impacts from radiation exposure) are included in the population group.

20.15. In Section 4.6, the Draft and Final EISs address the subsistence consumption of fish from Cattaraugus Creek. For atmospheric releases of radioactivity material from the WVDP site, the EIS considered the inhalation of radioactive gases and particulates in the air, ingestion of cultivated crops, and external exposure from radioactive material in the air or on the ground. In addition, the WVDP Annual Site Environmental Monitoring Reports address the inhalation of radioactive gases and particulates in air; ingestion of cultivated crops; and ingestion of fish, beef, and milk. Ingestion of surface water and groundwater was not included because there is no documented use of local surface water or downgradient groundwater wells as drinking water by local residents.

Inhaling radioactive material in wood smoke or water vapor was not considered in the analysis. However, because of the dispersion of wood smoke and dilution by the water in Cattaraugus Creek or Lake Erie, the radiation doses through these pathways would be much lower than inhaling the radioactive material directly from the air, which is analyzed in the Draft and Final EISs.

20.16. As described in Appendix C, Section C.6, radiation doses were evaluated at the locations of nearby residences for airborne releases during normal operations and at the WVDP site boundary for releases during accidents to provide a realistic estimate of the maximally exposed individual radiation doses.

20.17. In terms of the total fatalities from truck versus rail, truck transportation has slightly higher impacts than rail transportation for Alternatives A and B, while rail has slightly higher impacts for the No Action Alternative (see Tables 4-6, 4-12, and 4-15). The differences are due to several factors, including the route distances, the population densities along the routes, state-level accident rates along the routes, and the number of shipments.

20.18. With respect to potential risks from terrorism or diversion, DOE did describe the human health consequences of a transportation accident; the accident with the highest consequences would involve CH-TRU waste. DOE did not analyze, nor is it relevant to analyze, how such a transportation accident could occur (for example, as a result of a terrorist incident).

20.19. As described in Appendix C, Section C.6, radiation doses were evaluated at the locations of nearby residences for airborne releases during normal operations and at the WVDP site boundary for releases during accidents to provide a realistic estimate of the maximally exposed individual radiation doses. Population radiation doses included contributions from all directions for distances up to 80 kilometers (50 miles) from airborne releases during normal operations and from an onsite evaluation point located 640 meters (2,100 feet) from the postulated accident. The MEI dose is smaller than the population dose because the MEI dose is to one individual and the population dose is the dose received by everyone in the affected population collectively (not individually). The risk of a latent cancer fatality to the MEI is the risk one individual could face in dying from cancer caused by exposure to radiation from activities at the WVDP. The risk of a latent cancer fatality in a population is the number of additional cancers that might be experienced

in the entire affected population as a result of the exposure of the population to radiation from activities at the WVDP.

20.20. In the Final EIS, the sentence was changed to read "The net impact from these past operations to the regional population near the Center has been estimated to be approximately 13 person-rem."

20.21. The assumptions and methodology used to assess ecological risk are described in *A Graded Approach for Evaluating Radiation Doses to Aquatic and Terrestrial Biota*, referenced in Chapter 4 as DOE 2002. A brief description of the methods used to evaluate ecological risk has been added to Appendix C.

20.22. The dose is not averaged over the 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius, as stated by the commenter. Rather, it is integrated over the 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius, which means that all the potential doses within the 80 kilometer (50-mile) radius are added together.

20.23. The total impacts (i.e., risks) of transporting the radioactive material are contained in the last column of Tables 4-6, 4-12, 4-15, D-15, D-16, and D-17. In addition, the total impacts (i.e., risks) are discussed in the text of Chapter 4 for each alternative (Sections 4.3.3.1, 4.4.3.1, and 4.5.3.1) and Section D.7.1.

20.24. The EIS lists the probabilities of the maximum reasonably foreseeable accidents in Sections 4.3.3.3, 4.4.3.3, and 4.5.3.3, and in Section D.7.3.

20.25 The MEI dose is smaller than the population dose because the MEI dose is to one individual and the population dose is the dose received by everyone in the affected population collectively (not individually). The risk of a latent cancer fatality to the MEI is the risk one individual could face in dying from cancer caused by exposure to radiation from activities at the WVDP. The risk of a latent cancer fatality in a population is the number of additional cancers that might be experienced in the entire affected population as a result of the exposure of the population to radiation from activities at the WVDP.

Document #0021: Comments
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
(Recommendation 169)

Savannah River Site
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
A U.S. Department of Energy Site-Specific Advisory Board

Chairperson
Wade Waters
308 Pinewood Drive
Pooler, Ga. 31322

Vice Chairperson
Jean Sulc
24 Harbor River Circle
St. Helena Island, S.C. 29920

Members
Meryl Alaiot
Donna Antonucci
Jennifer Barrington
Leon Charvous
Ann Dalton
Gerald Devitt
Mary Drye
Melvyn Galin
Perry Holcomb
William Lawless
William Lawrence
Wendell Lyon
Darryl Nettles
Harold Rehn
Dorene Richardson
Lola Richardson
Murray Riley
DeAnne Smoak
William Vogele
Carolyne Williams
Gloria Williams-Way
William Willoughby

Ex-Officio Members
DOE
Alice Doswell
Charlie Anderson
EPA
Robert Pope
Dawn Taylor
SCDHEC
Keith Collinsworth
Myra Reece
State of Georgia
James Sanders

July 23, 2003

RECEIVED
AUG 0 8 2003
0021, 1 of 12

Mr. Jeff Allison, Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Savannah River Operations Office
Aiken, S.C. 29808

Dear Mr. Allison:

On behalf of the SRS CAB, I'm pleased to forward you the following five recommendations, all of which were adopted on July 22, 2003:

Recommendation 165- SRS National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
Recommendation 166- Historic Preservation at SRS
Recommendation 167- Deactivation & Decommissioning Plan
Recommendation 168- R Reactor Seepage Basin
Recommendation 169- Draft West Valley Demonstration Project WM EIS

Recommendations 165 and 168 are being sent to SCDHEC for response as well and all three agencies will recieve Recommendation 169 for response. Your assistance in forwarding recommendations to DOE-Headquarters as appropriate is greatly appreciated.

We look forward to your written response prior to our next Board meeting to be held September 23, 2003, in Aiken, S.C. We appreciate your timely consideration of the enclosed advice.

Sincerely,

Wade Waters
Chair

cc: Sandra Waisley, DOE-HQ
Fred Dowd, DOE-HQ
Charles Anderson, DOE-SR
Alice Doswell, DOE-SR
Daniel Sullivan, DOE West Valley
SSAB Chairs

Document #0021: Comments
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
(Recommendation 169)

Savannah River Site
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
A U.S. Department of Energy Site-Specific Advisory Board

Chairperson
Wade Waters
308 Pinewood Drive
Pooler, Ga. 31322

Vice Chairperson
Jean Sulc
24 Harbor River Circle
St. Helena Island, S.C. 29920

Members
Meryl Alaiot
Donna Antonucci
Jennifer Barrington
Leon Charvous
Ann Dalton
Gerald Devitt
Mary Drye
Melvyn Galin
Perry Holcomb
William Lawless
William Lawrence
Wendell Lyon
Darryl Nettles
Harold Rehn
Dorene Richardson
Lola Richardson
Murray Riley
DeAnne Smoak
William Vogele
Carolyne Williams
Gloria Williams-Way
William Willoughby

Ex-Officio Members
DOE
Alice Doswell
Charlie Anderson
EPA
Robert Pope
Dawn Taylor
SCDHEC
Keith Collinsworth
Myra Reece
State of Georgia
James Sanders

July 23, 2003

Mr. J.I. Palmer, Jr., Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth St., SW
Atlanta, Ga. 30303

Dear Mr. Palmer:

On behalf of the SRS Citizens Advisory Board, I'm pleased to forward you a recommendation adopted during our meeting held July 22, 2003, in Columbia, S.C. Robert Pope and Dawn Taylor, EPA Ex-Officio members were in attendance.

Recommendation 169 addresses alternatives for disposition of West Valley Demonstration Project waste. Four additional recommendations are included for your information as well.

We look forward to your written response to Recommendation 169 prior to our next Board meeting to be held September 22-23, 2003, in Aiken, S.C. We appreciate your timely consideration of the enclosed advice.

Sincerely,

Wade Waters
Chair

cc: Robert Pope, EPA Region IV
Dawn Taylor, EPA Region IV

0021, 2 of 12
RECEIVED
AUG 0 8 2003

RECEIVED

Document #0021: Comments
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
(Recommendation 169)

Pages 4 – 10 are not included in this document because they do not relate to WVDP or this EIS. As noted on Page 1, these pages consist of:

Recommendation 165- SRS National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
Recommendation 166- Historic Preservation at SRS
Recommendation 167- Deactivation & Decommissioning Plan
Recommendation 168- R Reactor Seepage Basin

See Recommendation 169 on the following pages.

Document #0021: Comments
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
(Recommendation 169)

Savannah River Site
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
A U.S. Department of Energy Site-Specific Advisory Board

Chairperson
Wade Waters
508 Pinewood Drive
Pooler, Ga. 31322

Vice Chairperson
Jean Sulc
24 Harbor River Circle
St. Helena Island, S.C. 29920

Members
Meryl Alaiof
Donna Antonucci
Jennifer Barrington
Leon Chavous
Ann Dalton
Gerald Devitt
Mary Drye
Melvyn Galin
Perry Holcomb
William Lawless
William Lawrence
Wendell Lyon
Darryl Nelles
Harold Rahn
Dorene Richardson
Lois Richardson
Murray Riley
DeAnne Smoak
William Vogele
Carolyne Williams
Gloria Williams-Way
William Willoughby

Ex-Officio Members
DOE
Alice Doswell
Charlie Anderson
EPA
Robert Pope
Dawn Taylor
SCDHEC
Keith Collinsworth
Myra Reece
State of Georgia
James Sanders

July 23, 2003

Mr. Lewis Shaw, Deputy Commissioner
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201

Dear Mr. Shaw:

On behalf of the SRS Citizens Advisory Board, I'm pleased to forward you several recommendations adopted during our meeting held July 22, 2003, in Columbia, S.C. Keith Collinsworth was the Ex-Officio representative in attendance.

Recommendation 165 addresses the SRS National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit Revision. Recommendation 168 addresses the R Reactor Seepage Basin and Recommendation 169 addresses alternatives for disposition of waste from the West Valley Demonstration Project.

Two additional recommendations are also included for your information as well.

We look forward to your written response prior to our next Board meeting to be held September 22-23, 2003, in Aiken, S.C.. We appreciate your timely consideration of this advice.

Sincerely,

Wade Waters

Wade Waters
Chair

cc: Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC

0021 3 of 12
RECEIVED
AUG 0 8 2003

Document #0021: Comment 21.1
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
(Recommendation 169)

RECEIVED
AUG 0 8 2003
0021, 11 of 12

Savannah River Site
Citizens Advisory Board

Recommendation 169

Draft WVDP Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement

Background

In accordance with directives in the West Valley Demonstration Project (WVDP) Act, DOE is responsible for facilities used in connection with the WVDP High Level Waste (HLW) vitrification effort and for the disposal of the Low Level Waste (LLW), mixed LLW, HLW, and TRU waste produced by the WVDP HLW solidification program. To fulfill its responsibilities under this Act, DOE needs to identify a disposal path for wastes that are currently stored onsite and that will occur over the next 10 years and to determine a management strategy for the existing waste storage tanks. The April draft EIS focuses on DOE's responsibilities to dispose of wastes and continue to safely mange the waste storage tanks.

The Draft WVDP Waste Management EIS analyzes three alternatives for the continued onsite waste management and shipment of wastes to offsite disposal (Ref. 1). Under the No Action Alternative, Continuation of Ongoing Waste Management Activities, waste management would include continued storage of existing Class B and Class C LLW, TRU waste and HLW. Limited amounts of Class A LLW would be shipped to offsite disposal and the remainder would be stored onsite.

Under Alternative A (Preferred Alternative), Offsite Shipment of HLW, LLW, Mixed LLW, and TRU Wastes to Disposal and Ongoing Management of the Waste Storage Tanks, DOE would ship Class A, B, and C LLW and mixed LLW to one of two DOE potential disposal sites (Washington or Nevada) or to a commercial disposal site (such as Envirocare); ship TRU waste to WIPP in New Mexico; and ship HLW to the proposed Yucca Mountain HLW Repository.

Under Alternative B, Offsite Shipment of LLW, Mixed LLW to Disposal, Shipment of HLW and TRU Waste to Interim Storage, and Interim Stabilization of the Waste Storage Tanks, LLW and mixed LLW would be shipped offsite for disposal at the same locations as Alternative A. TRU wastes would be shipped for interim storage at one of five DOE sites: Hanford in Washington; Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL); Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL); Savannah River Site (SRS); or WIPP. TRU wastes would subsequently be shipped to WIPP or remain at WIPP for disposal. HLW would be shipped to SRS or Hanford for interim storage, with subsequent shipment to Yucca Mountain for disposal.

Comment

The SRS Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) supports the Preferred Alternative but can accept Alternative B, specifically SRS receiving waste shipments from WVDP provided that certain stipulations apply. The SRS CAB is on record recommending that the vitrified HLW from WVDP come to SRS for storage prior to shipment to Yucca Mountain, contingent upon the opening of Yucca Mountain and other commitments (Ref. 2 & 3). The CAB was not unanimous concerning this decision and some of the dissenting opinions were based on equity considerations (Ref. 4). Since then, the SRS CAB has supported the DOE regional waste disposal concept as 21.1

Document #0021: Comment 21.2
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
(Recommendation 169)

proposed in the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Ref. 5). Under this concept, SRS has the potential to receive LLW from seven DOE facilities. The CAB supported the efforts of DOE to optimize waste disposal across the DOE complex and held the view that the regional concept should be viewed with a national perspective instead of a parochial one. However, the SRS CAB was very clear that its support for a regional disposal concept was contingent upon other states participating in the concept. The SRS CAB fully expects equable treatment (Ref. 6). If wastes are going to be received at SRS from other DOE facilities, then concessions and acceleration of SRS waste disposal are expected.

Recommendation

The SRS Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) recommends to the three agencies that TRU waste and HLW coming to SRS be accepted from WVDP if the following conditions are met:

1. TRU Waste storage shall be available at SRS to accept WVDP TRU waste or funding (above site mission operating budget) shall be available to design and construct such storage facilities. 21.1
2. SRS high activity TRU waste (Pu-238) is placed on a priority disposal schedule and all appropriate shipping containers are made available to comply with the Performance Management Plan shipping schedule. In addition, for every volume of WVDP transuranic waste received by SRS, a shipment of high activity SRS transuranic waste equal to twice the receiving volume shall be shipped to WIPP.
3. A HLW shipping and receiving facility shall be constructed and operational at SRS in order to be able to ship SRS vitrified HLW canisters to the HLW repository prior to receiving WVDP HLW.
4. A second glass waste canister storage building should be constructed and operational at SRS prior to receiving WVDP HLW.
5. Both the WVDP and SRS HLW shipments are included along with the first shipments of defense nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain.
6. Funding shall be made available to cover any additional handling costs.
7. Any transuranic waste shipped to SRS for temporary storage must be designated as defense waste packaged in a form that meets the WIPP WAC so that it may be shipped directly for disposal without any further processing by SRS. Certified and licensed shipping containers must be available for its future shipment for disposal.

References

1. Draft West Valley Demonstration Project Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement, DOE/EIS-0337D, April 2003.
2. Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation No. 51 (adopted November 18, 1997), "Environmental Management Integration High Level Waste."
3. Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation No. 82 (adopted March 23, 1999), "Waste Management programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision for High Level Waste."
4. Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation No. 63 (adopted July 28, 1998), "Political, Regulatory, and State Equity Issues and Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Defense-Related Nuclear Wastes and Material."
5. Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation No. 72 (adopted November 17, 1998), " Waste Management programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
6. Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation No. 118 (adopted March 28, 2000), "Waste Management Equity Issues."

RECEIVED
AUG 0 8 2003
0021 12 of 12

Document #0021: Responses

21.1. The WM PEIS studied the potential for nationwide impacts of managing radioactive and hazardous wastes. DOE issued separate RODs for all of the waste types analyzed in the WM PEIS. For TRU waste, DOE decided that each site that has generated or would generate TRU waste would store it onsite prior to shipment to WIPP for disposal (63 Fed. Reg. 3629 (1998)). However, the Department may decide to ship TRU waste from sites where it may be impractical to prepare it for disposal to other sites where DOE has or will have the necessary capability. The sites that could receive TRU waste from other sites are INEEL, ORR, SRS, and the Hanford Site.

Thus, DOE's analysis in the Draft and Final WVDP Waste Management EISs of the disposal or interim storage of WVDP waste is consistent with analyses conducted for the WM PEIS and with decisions reached on the basis of that document.

However, the shipment of waste to offsite locations for interim storage is not DOE's preferred alternative. Under the preferred alternative (Alternative A), TRU waste and HLW would continue to be stored at the WVDP site until such time as disposal offsite could be arranged.

After the publication of the Final EIS, DOE will issue a Record of Decision. This document will state what DOE's decision is, identify the alternatives considered in reaching its decision, and specify the alternative or alternatives that are considered to be environmentally preferable. DOE will also identify and discuss the factors that were balanced by the agency in making its decision and state how those considerations entered into its decision.

21.2 Thank you for your comment.