



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Strategic & Long Term Issues Committee**

#### **Meeting Summary**

May 22, 2000  
DeSoto Hilton Hotel  
Savannah, GA

---

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Strategic and Long Term Issues (S&LTI) Committee met on Monday, May 22, at the DeSoto Hilton, Savannah, GA. The purpose of the meeting was to review CAB Recommendations #120 and #121, discuss stewardship path forward, the budget and prioritization process and hear public comments. Those attending the meeting were:

#### **CAB Members**

Mel Galin\*  
Bill Vogeles\*  
Bill Adams\*  
P.K. Smith\*  
Carolyne Williams\*\*

#### **DOE/Contractors**

Delisa Bratcher, DOE  
Clay Jones, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC

\* Denotes S&LTI Committee Members

\*\*Denotes S&LTI Committee Members not present

Mel Galin, Committee Chair, welcomed those in attendance and reviewed the agenda. For the status of CAB Recommendations #120 and 121, it was decided to leave both recommendations open. On #120, DOE responded that they would brief the CAB on the efforts and results of their attempt to get more funding from DOE-HQ. The recommendation will remain open until the committee receives that briefing. Recommendation #121 will remain open until results are obtained on the DOE-HQ budget adjustment to Congress requesting funding for Pu 3013 stabilization capability.

P. K. Smith reviewed the stewardship effort to-date. She commented on the workshop at Oak Ridge last year as well as information and definitions of stewardship that is available. Ms. Smith suggested that a working group or team be organized to look at all the data available and report back to the committee. She suggested that the same CAB members that participated in the Oak Ridge workshop be on the team. Mr. Galin suggested that they bring it up to the full CAB. Ms. Smith also noted that at the last meeting it was requested that Jim Werner, DOE-HQ, Stewardship Director, be asked to attend a CAB meeting to discuss the DOE-HQ efforts.

Clay Jones, WSRC Strategic and Integration Department Program Integration manager, reviewed the budget and prioritization process. Mr. Jones stated that priority decisions are made during the budget cycle. The key issue is the difference between the funding target allocated and the site funding needs. The difference expected for 2001 exceeds \$100 million. He explained the many different conflicting desires of not only the external stakeholders, but also the internal SRS stakeholders.

In determining the priority of which projects get funded, multiple criteria are evaluated to determine the risk. In this case, risk is defined as consequence times probability. The criteria evaluated to determine

consequences were extensively reviewed and modified by the CAB when the criteria was developed. The nine criteria are public health and safety, environmental protection, worker safety and health, regulatory compliance, mission impact, safeguards and security, social/cultural/ economic, cost effectiveness/mortgage reduction, and mission viability. Risk is assessed in the prioritization model by considering if an activity is suspended for one year and an "event" occurs, what is the risk. One of the flaws of this model, is that it doesn't evaluate the risk in the following years.

A consequence value matrix, also reviewed and modified by the CAB, was developed on each project. The worse case event was determined and evaluated according to the low impact to high impact of that event. A value was then defined for each criterion. In scoring the matrix, the likelihood of an event occurring was also evaluated. SRS experts evaluated the ranking and scoring to ensure the model is consistently employed across all programs. From this, an initial priority ranking is developed. The highest priority work packages are those that maintain a minimum safe condition for inventoried nuclear facilities. This exercise is done for Environmental Management programs only, i.e., it is not done for Defense Programs or Material Disposition programs.

In the fiscal year (FY) 2001, the highest categories on the priority list are the risk/hazard containment activities or surveillance and maintenance (S&M) activities. Next on the list are the work packages essential for doing business at the site. Compliance activities and facility operations are next. Mortgage reduction and best business practices are next. For FY 2001, the target budget was \$1,266 million while the site needs were \$1,478 million.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) has reviewed this prioritization process and it is current being independently reviewed by the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP).

In summary, the prioritization process is an effective tool for determining the priority of funding projects for the site. The CAB has been very involved in developing and modifying the process. Bill Vogele praised the approach and said he hadn't seen this prioritization process used before. Mr. Jones invited Mr. Vogele to come to the site and more time could be spent explaining the details. Mr. Vogele excepted the invitation and a meeting will be planned.

Mr. Galin asked if there were any public comments. Since there were none, Mr. Galin adjourned the meeting.

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