



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

January 22, 1996

Hilton Head Island, S.C.

The Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met on January 22, 1996, at the Hilton Resort, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina. This all-day meeting was divided into three sessions: the morning session from 9:30 to 12:00 was to discuss the Vision document in support of CAB Recommendation Number 8 and to provide comments on Revision 1 of the Draft Savannah River Site Future Use Project Report; the afternoon session from 1:30 to 4:30 was to discuss the Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Prioritization process; and the evening session from 7:30 to 9:00 was to review the Vision document and to discuss activities for the to work on for 1996.

Morning Session: Vision Document and Draft SRS Future Use Project Report Discussion

Attendees of the morning and afternoon sessions included Citizen Advisory Board members Kamalakar Raut, Tom Greene, Bill Donaldson, Andrew Rea, Pat Tousignant, and Vernon Zinnerman; members of the public who participated were George Minot, Dave Christensen, Dan Durett (United Negro College Fund representative), Karen Lowrie (Consortium on Risk Evaluation for Stakeholder Participation), and Vanessa Davis; Savannah River Site employees who attended included Rick Ford, Mary Flora, and Gail Jernigan; designated federal officials who attended were Virginia Gardner, Gerry Flemming, and Ernest Chaput. Walt Joseph, the Citizens Advisory Board Facilitator, also attended.

Vernon Zinnerman, Chairman of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee, began the meeting with a welcome and self-introductions were made by all present. The majority of the meeting was to discuss the Vision document. (See attached copy of the Vision Document; the one dated January 5, 1996 was the version the group began with; the one dated January 23, 1996 shows the revisions to this document.) All changes are underlined and strike-thrus show what was deleted.

The Draft Savannah River Site Future Use Project Report was discussed next. At the previous CAB meeting there were numerous comments that the recommendations in the draft report did not align with the recommendations of the CAB. Ernie Chaput promised to have the recommendations revised and another draft of the report be sent to CAB members for their review. Participants agreed that the recommendations in the second draft more closely aligned with the CAB recommendation. Other comments on the second draft of the report included the following:

- the CAB Vision document shows a vision for the site; the Executive Summary of the SRS Future Use Project Report should include the vision from the CAB Vision document.
- the Executive Summary does not read easily due to the acronyms. The meeting adjourned until after lunch. After lunch a few other comments were received on the second draft of the SRS Future Use Project Report. These comments included:
- The Land-Use Baseline Report is an excellent document and should be included as an appendix to the SRS Future Use Project Report.
- The Executive Summary references "minorities" and "disadvantaged." The Citizens for Environmental Justice do not consider themselves either minorities or disadvantaged so these terms should be changed in the text. Acceptable terms include "people of color," "economically "disadvantaged," or "disenfranchised."
- There was additional discussion on the comment to include the CAB vision in the SRS Future Use Project Report. Some felt that the vision in the CAB Vision document was developed by the CAB and should remain only in the CAB document. They did not want the CAB words to show up in a DOE document. After further discussion, it was decided to recommend that DOE write a vision statement which should be included in the Executive Summary.

Afternoon Session: Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Prioritization Process Discussion

The afternoon session of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee meeting focused on an update and discussion of the Fiscal Year 1998 (FY98) Budget development process. A primary purpose of this discussion was to obtain comments from meeting attendees on the initial prioritized list of SRS activities. Attendees present during this portion of the meeting included: Vernon Zinnerman, Pat Tousignant, Bob Slay, Andrew Rea, Tom Greene, Kamalakar Raut, Bill Donaldson and Mildred McClain, CAB members; Walt Joseph, CAB facilitator; Leslie Huber, Clay Jones and Mary Flora, WSRC; Rick Ford, Ernie Chaput, Virginia Gardner and Linda Lingle, DOE; and Dan Durrett, public citizen.

Ernie Chaput opened the discussion on the FY98 Budget by emphasizing the importance of the work undertaken by the RM&FU Subcommittee and working group to enhance the process for the developing the FY98 budget. Mr. Chaput provided a description of the general budget process. He then noted that the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) can play an important role in developing the prioritization model used in the FY98 budget. Mr. Chaput commended the RM&FU Subcommittee and working group for the input provided to SRS regarding the criteria that should be used when prioritizing SRS activities.

Mr. Chaput continued explaining the budget process noting the draft FY98 budget submittal is due to DOE-Headquarters (HQ) on February 1, 1996. This list should reflect stakeholder comments. Following this, SRS will work to refine this list for the final budget submittal that is due to DOE-HQ on April 15. Additional opportunities for stakeholder input will be available through June. Mr. Chaput stressed DOE is looking for opinions on which activities should be funded and which should not, recognizing public opinions differ and that understanding various viewpoints, concerns and issues is important in developing a prioritized list of activities. Mr. Chaput explained that SRS used the nine criteria developed by the RM&FU Subcommittee and

working group to prioritize the 60 SRS work packages. A discussion followed on the four basic types of activities at SRS: Safe Storage and Surveillance & Maintenance; Materials Stabilization and Cleanup; Infrastructure and Site Support; and, Improvements/Cost Reductions.

Clay Jones then briefed the group on the preliminary prioritized list of the 60 work packages. This list included rough funding estimates for each of the 60 work packages. Comparing the preliminary prioritized list with the FY98 target budget of \$1.029 billion, Mr. Jones illustrated that not all SRS work packages will be funded. He noted that SRS has made significant progress in reducing costs, but that even with that success of working smarter, SRS will not be able to fund all activities originally planned for FY98. Mr. Chaput agreed savings to date have been significant and SRS is committed to finding additional savings in the future, but noted finding these savings will become more difficult.

Mr. Chaput then asked the group for specific comments on the preliminary prioritized list. He stated the issue SRS must face often focuses on the Risk vs. Compliance issue. As an example, he noted that several of the lower risk work packages are compliance driven activities with enforceable schedules. Therefore SRS must decide whether to fund low-risk/compliance driven items or work with the regulatory agencies to request relief. The following comments were offered:

- DOE is obligated to fund compliance related obligations. DOE must evaluate whether the Target funding is adequate. It seems the FY98 Target is insufficient to accomplish all that needs to be done at SRS. Please compare the amount of money currently budgeted for SRS ER activities with ER activities at other DOE facilities, such as Oak Ridge or Rocky Flats. If SRS ER funding this year, next year and FY98 is lower than the other facilities, then DOE-HQ should provide SRS more funding to meet its compliance obligations.
- The process and the criteria being used to implement the process are good.
- If possible, the manpower mix requirements should be included in the budget submittal.
- It would be helpful to compare the FY97 list developed last year with what DOE is proposing to do in FY97 now. This comparison would be helpful each year to see how reliable the predictions are of what needs to be done more than a year in advance. In other words, is what you know now sufficient to plan for work 1.5 years from now?
- Cost Effectiveness should not be ignored in the equation. For instance, if you look at the funding for Work Package #42 (DWPF @ 250 canisters), spending that incremental money now will save a tremendous amount of money over the long-term. DOE should consider moving this item up on the list.
- DOE should make sure it takes care of its compliance obligations before trying to get additional funds for new mission projects.
- If SCDHEC will not allow DOE to re-negotiate its compliance agreements, this may be sufficient reason for DOE-HQ or Congress to provide SRS with additional funding. It is reasonable to assume that DOE facilities that negotiate with states that are flexible in compliance negotiations will receive less funding than facilities that face large fines or penalties.
- It would be helpful for SRS to continue this process and explain how the criteria were implemented in the prioritization process. Additionally, which criteria would DOE favor

using? The final list DOE-SR sends to DOE-HQ should be shared with the stakeholders and information provided on the rationale used in the final DOE-SR list.

- The method used in the prioritization appears reasonable, recognizing that things change. Therefore, following the process and comparing future lists with those being generated now would be good.
- The funding being proposed for SRS is inadequate. SRS should "get a bigger piece of the pie." DOE should provide target funding levels for other DOE facilities.

Following some discussion on these comments, the group decided a brief version of this presentation should be provided to the full CAB on January 23, 1996. Mr. Jones agreed to provide this briefing. Mrs. Chaput and Jones closed this portion of the meeting by thanking the group for the comments and noting additional opportunities to get involved in the budget process would occur.

Evening Session: Vision Document and Activities for 1996 Discussion

Savannah River Site Citizen Advisory Board participants in the evening meeting included Mildred McClain, Kamalakar Raut, Andrew Rea and Vernon Zimmerman; members of the public who participated included George Minot, Dave Christensen, Audrey Goetze, (Consortium on Risk Evaluation for Stakeholder Participation), Barry Schlegel (Consortium on Risk Evaluation for Stakeholder Participation); South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control representatives who attended were Shelley Phipps, Danny Hanson, Alan Collum, and Myra Reece; Gail Jernigan attended as a support person from the Savannah River Site and Rick Ford and Ernest Chaput were the designated federal officials for the meeting.

Vernon Zimmerman welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. The Vision document was reviewed and no other changes were suggested. The participants then listed the activities that the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee should be addressing in 1996.

Activities suggested included the following:

- Budget Prioritization with the Waste Management and Environmental Restoration Subcommittee, with possibly the Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee and the Outreach Subcommittee
- Publish and implement of the Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation Number 8 and Vision document. (e.g., go to Washington, DC and meet with DOE, DOD, and Congressional representatives) The Citizens Advisory Board should request a proposal for a consultant or developmental planner to develop a plan to implement the recommendation.
- Provide answers for the accelerator and/or tritium production source and the impacts on the Savannah River Site
- Review and ask questions about the Record of Decision of the Interim Management of Nuclear Materials Environmental Impact Statement; may provide recommendations to the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

- Review the Environmental Impact Statement on the storage and disposition of weapons usable materials; may want to collect comments for consideration by the Citizens Advisory Board
- Review and provide comments on the Proposed Site Treatment Plan
- Provide an education program on risk assessments
- Provide an educational program on cost benefit analysis
- Investigate whether SRS should be the interim storage location for high-level waste canisters
- Arrange for presentations, scheduling, and implementation of proposed movement from the monoculture timber production mission to biologically indigenous forestry

Ernest Chaput, Deputy Site Manager, said the DOE has a list of possible future missions for the site that he would be willing to share with the Citizens Advisory Board to help the Citizens Advisory Board in implementing future use activities. The path forward included Gail Jernigan to publish a list of these activities in these meeting notes and Vernon Zimmerman to talk to PK Smith about activities that may not been related to the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee. The meeting was adjourned.

NOTE: MEETING HANDOUTS MAY BE OBTAINED BY CALLING THE SRS CAB TOLL-FREE NUMBER AT 1-800-249-8155.