



# **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

## **Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee**

### **Meeting Record**

March 2, 1999  
North Augusta Community Center  
N. Augusta, S. C.

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on Tuesday, March 2, 6:00 p.m., at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the budget planning strategy, Recommendation #58 response, a potential recommendation on the Defense Waste Processing Facility canister production, and hear public comment. Attendance was as follows:

<b><u>CAB Members</u></b>	<b><u>Stakeholders</u></b>	<b><u>DOE/Contractors</u></b>
Wade Waters	Pat Miles	Jim Buice, DOE
	Todd Crawford	George Mishra, DOE
	Bill McDonell	Steve Baker, DOE
	Thomas Rolka, DHEC	Joan Baum, DOE
	Elmer Wilhite	Clay Jones, WSRC
	JShelia McFalls	Gail Jernigan, WSRC
	Gary Percival	Jim Moore, WSRC

Wade Waters, Co-Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. Mr. Waters reviewed the agenda for the evening and then introduced Clay Jones, WSRC, to present the site budget planning strategy.

Mr. Jones stated that he would like to define the budget problem and criteria, obtain public comment on key considerations for the problem resolution and then review the site draft priority list.

Mr. Jones explained a graph that showed the following lines:

- Out Year Budget (OYB) Guidance – A straight line from fiscal year (FY) 2000 through FY 2006 which reflected level funding at \$1.222 billion.
- Constant FY 2000 dollars with FY 2000 buying power – Plotted the reduction in buying power due to inflation.
- "Best Effort" Compliance Case – Estimate of dollars needed to meet compliance.

The graph depicted a gap of approximately \$200 million dollars in FY 2000. This gap results in major impacts to the site. Consideration is being given to scale back in Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) canister production and delays in the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF). The risk-based model used for the Integrated Priority List (IPL) worked well for activities with one-year delay, but does not work for long-term delays. The site will request funding (FY 2001 budget) for the "Best Effort" Compliance Case but they feel they will not be able to get that much money. They have decided to submit

the Paths to Closure as a Planning Case that will split the difference between the "Best Effort" Compliance Case and the OYB Guidance (or Target) case.

The site will use the risk-based activity evaluation criteria, which has been reviewed by the CAB to set the priorities of the activities. In addition, the work at the site has been split into four categories of work. They are (1) Waste/Materials Storage Operations which includes proper management of current material and waste on site, (2) Nuclear Material Stabilization, (3) Environmental Restoration and (4) Waste Management. The challenge is to determine how to allocate scarce resources to maximize SRS mission accomplishments.

Mr. Jones reviewed some key considerations for problem resolution. They included the time dependent nature of risk assessment, cost and practicality of facility demobilizing and re-mobilizing, balancing competing stakeholder needs, regulatory commitments and others.

Mr. Jones asked the individuals present, based on the reduction in funding and the scope of work needing completion, what were their ideas in approaching the problem. After much discussion, Mr. Jones handed out a draft of the prioritized Environmental Management activities for FY 2001. Mr. Jones pointed out the activities that would be funded in the Target, Planning, and "Best Effort" Compliance (or Full Requirements) case.

Issues, comments and questions that were recorded on a flip chart are as follows:

- How do you quantitatively handle the priorities for the site in a qualitative manner?
- How do we know what is the most important activity on the priority list if we do not have risk analysis for each activity?
- There is a need to do more quantitative work on what are the consequences for not funding activities, i.e., what is the damage to the environment and to workers or people off-site?
- We don't want wastes to leave (escape) the site, but what are the risk numbers to the public if there is a release?
- What is the "significance" of the risk for treating wastes in F&H Areas as compared to other risks?
- Regulatory decisions look at one year while the site has a multi-year funding problem.
- Regulatory compliance covers the state of South Carolina. The regulations require a reduction in the contamination of groundwater in locations where people do not drink the water. This results in funding a low-risk activity while a high-risk activity goes unfunded.
- Can funding be reduced in any of the activities in Waste/Materials Storage Operations section?
- The risk model used for the Integrated Priority List looks at activities on a year to year basis (near term). Can this same risk model be used over a period of time (long range)?
- What activities in the priority list will not be done?
- The activities in the Planning Case need funding as well as the activities above the Target Case.
- How will the new missions be funded?
- Where will the funding come from for the wastes generated by the new missions?

Mr. Jones stated that the priority list is due to DOE-HQ April 15. If anyone had any comments or input, please forward them to Jim Moore before the deadline so they could be considered.

Mr. Waters reviewed the subcommittee's letter of response to CAB Recommendation #58 that was developed by Todd Crawford. Mr. Waters stated that Dave Huizenga, DOE-HQ would be attending the CAB meeting on March 22 to discuss the FY 2000 budget. It was decided after modifications that the subcommittee should try to get the letter forwarded to DOE-HQ under the subcommittee co-chair's signatures as soon as possible so Mr. Huizenga would be able to better address questions at the March 22 meeting.

Mr. Waters reviewed the draft motion on the FY 2000 which would recommend that DOE-HQ increase the budget by \$55 million so that production of DWPF canisters could increase from 100 canisters per year to 250 canisters per year. There were questions on whether the number should be 200 or 250 canisters per year. Mr. Crawford was requested to verify the number with Mr. Howard Gnann. This draft motion will be a joint motion between the Environmental Remediation and Waste Management Subcommittee and the RM&FU Subcommittee. Both subcommittees will review the motion. Mr. Crawford will modify the motion and send it out for comment and approval.

With no other public comment, Mr. Waters adjourned the meeting.

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