

## AGENDA

### NCRP PAC 5 Meeting ENVIRONMENTAL RADIATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Hyatt Regency  
Bethesda, MD  
(Executive Board Room)  
March 7, 2010 (Sunday)

1:30 p.m. – 1:40 p.m.	Opening Remarks	Chen
1:40 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.	Status of PAC5 and Activities	Chen
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Briefing on the Related Agency Activities and Others <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• States (CRCPD)</li><li>• DOE/HS</li><li>• DOE/EM</li><li>• EPA</li><li>• Others</li></ul>	Lipoti Wallo Letournau* Clark
3:00 p.m. – 3:20 p.m.	Break	
3:20 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Review of NCRP Proposed Projects	All
4:00 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.	Suggestions/Comments	All
4:15 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Review of Comments on Draft SC 64-22 Report	PAC 5 Designated Reviewers
5:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

\*See attachment

NCRP PAC 5 Meeting Minutes  
March 07, 2010  
Hyatt Regency Hotel  
Bethesda, Maryland

Participants

S.Y. Chen; Mary Clark; Jill LiPoti; Margaret MacDonell; Carl Paperiello, Andrew Wallo, III; Chris Whipple; Anthony Wolbarst; and Thomas Tenforde (NCRP President). Absent were Bruce Napier, Martin Letourneau and Tom Gesell.

Discussion

- S.Y. Chen opened the meeting by welcoming all PAC 5 members and also briefed participants on the potential PAC 5 proposals, including the pending DHS project (i.e., SC 5-1) that pertains to decision making regarding long-term cleanup associated with nuclear or radiological event (IND/RDD).
- Short briefings were provided for individual agencies by Jill Lipoti (State), Andy Wallo (DOE), and Mary Clark (EPA). Jill briefly summarized the current CRCPD programs. Mary touched on the pending changes in 10 CFR 190, 192 rule series, as well as the low-activity waste issues. Andy briefed on the changes in DOE orders and recent activities on waste management in Marty Letourneau's absence. Andy also briefed on the guidance development on radiological events; he mentioned a possible development of IND-related guidance beyond the current effort. S.Y. touched on the ongoing proposal by NRC on low-level waste rule making initiatives including the one that would involve "down blending" the "B" and "C" wastes into "A" Class. PAC 5 will likely follow these activities to gauge any potential interest for future NCRP projects.
- The Committee was asked to review the potential projects that are currently listed in the NCRP's 2010 Strategic Plan. The Committee agreed that a successful completion of the pending project SC 5-1 (Approach to Optimizing Decision Making for Late Phase Recovery from Nuclear or Radiological Terrorism Incidents" will likely induce a number of follow-on projects in related areas such as radioactive materials and waste management, cleanup strategy and technology, as well as new methodologies for radiological assessment. Other projects included (1) Developing Cost-Effective Strategies for the Cleanup and Restoration of DOE Nuclear Waste Sites and Facilities Formerly Used for the Production of Special Nuclear Materials and Weapons; (2) Performing Restoration at DOE Sites that is Protective of Public Health Without the Destruction of Natural Resources and Ecosystem; (3) Environmental Management of Lands Contaminated with Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials; and (4) Guidance on the Management and Control of Recycled Orphan Radiation Sources. It is expected that the emerging "nuclear renaissance" will likely engender issues that would become appropriate NCRP report topics.

- While the plenary session adjourned at 4:15 p.m., a special review session was conducted for Committee SC64-22's draft report, "Design of Effective Radiological Effluent Monitoring and Environmental Surveillance Programs." The session was conducted by Dr. Bernd Kahn (also present was Consultant Ivan White), Chair of SC64-22 with participation from the following reviewers: Jill Lipoti, Carl Paperiello, Andy Wallo, Chris Whipple, and S.Y. Chen (Bruce Napier absent). Dr. Kahn explained the approach to the report reparation and answered some general questions. It was expected that the PAC 5 comments will be due by April 1, and revision afterwards will be made prior to submitting the report for Council review.
- The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

**Input from Martin Letourneau**

-----Original Message-----

From: Letourneau, Martin [<mailto:Martin.Letourneau@em.doe.gov>]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 2009 2:55 PM  
To: Chen, Shih-Yew  
Subject: RE: 2009 NCRP PAC 5 Meeting (March 1, 2009)

EM is currently trying to figure out how we are going to spend an additional \$6 Billion coming to the Department under the "Stimulus Package". Jay Rhoderick has had the lead, and sites have been submitting proposals to HQ that are being vetted both for their timeliness and there effectiveness. For example, a project that requires a new EIS or permit would be low on the funding priorities because the up front work would take too long to complete before the real work could get started. The goal is to be able to make actual work happen within 6 months and to spend the allocated funds within 2 years.

For example, the D&D work at Savannah River has been on hold due to lack of funding. Applying some of the stimulus resources to additional D&D at SRS is something that can happen very quickly and have immediate results.

Under the Mercury Export Ban Act, the Department has the lead to identify a site within the US to be a host facility for all elemental mercury in the US. DOE will need to prepare an EIS, select a site, develop the site, and develop a chargeback system for commercial entities to pay the government to take their elemental mercury.

The Office of Environmental Management is getting ready to initiate an update to the Complex-Wide Review, which was completed in 1996 as one of the DNFSB Recommendation 94-2 actions. It has been over 10 years, and we would like to see what things have improved, what has not, and what new issues there may be that need to be addressed. As with the previous Complex-Wide Review, this new effort will lead into an update to DOE Order 435.1 (Radioactive Waste Management). 435.1 is essentially sound, and there is no need to revise its structure, but there are some things that can be improved and we have 10 years of lessons-learned to build off of. The intent is to improve areas that can be, add new guidance where needed, and update to current ICRP and NCRP expectations as needed.

We continue to make progress on closing HLW tanks at our sites, and are currently transplanting the process we used so successfully at Savannah River to Hanford. Starting next week, we will begin conducting "scoping meetings" for a performance assessment that is intended to support closure of the C Tank Farm at Hanford once the Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS is completed (expected to be in about 1 to 1 and 1/2 years).

Secretary Chu and Ines Triay have challenged us to find a role for the Department's advance computing capabilities through the National Labs in our PA work. We have only just started that discussion, and are trying to figure out how to meet that challenge.